

the partitioning of Lithuania and that the United States continue to recognize the sovereignty of the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

419. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Rev. Francis Martin Ruland and other citizens of Sioux City, Iowa, in opposition to any representation of organized religion at the peace conference unless representation is open to every denomination and sect, and then only in an advisory capacity, where the interests of constituencies are concerned; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

420. Also, petition of Rev. Francis Martin Ruland and other citizens of Sioux City, Iowa, in opposition to the passage of any postwar conscription measure until after the final cessation of present hostilities, and until a thorough formation of a plan has been presented to the American people in a plebiscite; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

421. Also, petition of Rev. Francis Martin Ruland and other citizens of Sioux City, Iowa, in opposition to personal representation of the President of the United States at the Vatican and to formal ambassadorship from the United States to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

422. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Richland County, Ohio, protesting transfer of troops from the European theater of war to the Pacific battle fronts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

423. By Mr. MERROW: Petition adopted by the board of directors of the New England Farm Equipment Dealers' Association, favoring the erasure of Federal tax exemptions to any and all groups in competition with tax-paying business that the original constitutional concept of tax equality may again be realized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

424. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Filipino Community Council of Honolulu, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expression of thankfulness for the prompt passage of the Filipino naturalization bill in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

425. Also, petition of the crew of the S. S. Santa Marta, United Fruit Co., with 48 signatures, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of a merchant seamen's bill of rights along the lines of the one passed by a grateful Nation in behalf of our armed forces; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

426. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Cambridge, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable passage of the merchant seamen's bill of rights, to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, April 16, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, whose heart is wide to harbor all our race yet knoweth each as a shepherd knows his sheep, in all our aimless wanderings we turn unfilled to Thee, the Good Shepherd, for it is Thy rod and Thy staff that comfort

us. May Thy goodness and mercy follow those who from this Chamber have sped to the east to witness the ghastly exhibit of human perversity at its worst and those who have journeyed to the west to vow with freemen, whose faith and arms have brought arrogant tyranny to the dust, that under God there shall be a new birth of freedom and enduring peace in all the earth. May this convening congress of freemen by the side of the vast sea herald the fulfillment at last of every prophet's dream of a golden day for all the sundered sons of the one Father—

"When the war drums throb no longer
And the battle flags are furled
In the parliament of man—
The federation of the world."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 23, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 23, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S 288 An act for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.;

S 530. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; and

S 531. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.

THE SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a week ago the Senate by unanimous vote adopted an amendment to the national draft law which would forestall the effects of the arbitrary selective-service ruling which was stripping the farms of needed and irreplaceable help. Last week, also, I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, the War Manpower Director, and the Director of Selective Service, respectively, requesting that they immediately confer with one another and with the military in order to institute remedial measures which would get more hands on the farms. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(The letter is as follows:)

APRIL 21, 1945.

HON. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WICKARD: I am certain that in view of the tremendous drain which is going to be put upon America to provide for the starving and undernourished millions in Europe, you cannot be unaware of the imperative need of immediately getting more help back on the farms, into food production

plants, the milk and cheese factories, canneries, etc. You cannot be unaware of the fact that only by providing more hands for agricultural production can we be adequate to the challenge which has been placed upon us.

You know what has happened, for example, in Holland, with the land inundated, the livestock gone, the people hungry. All across the European Continent the fields that could be producing are black with the wastage of war. The hands that could be at work on them are dispersed, and when they are available are often sick and undernourished.

We cannot allow those whom we have liberated to starve.

I am, therefore, respectfully asking of you that you get together with the military and explore every possible means by which more agricultural help may be made available for food production, for example, through the release of needed workers now in the armed forces.

Time is crucial. Indecision, buck passing, or excuses of today will have terrible repercussions tomorrow. I implore you on behalf of America's nutritional welfare, on behalf of that of our fighting sons and daughters and that of our millions of allies, those under arms and civilians, to confer and take constructive action at the earliest possible moment.

I shall be awaiting definite word from you. With kind regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

(Same letter sent to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, National Selective Service, and War Manpower Director Paul V. McNutt.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, evidences are mounting at every hand pointing to the gravity of the farm help situation. The draft and migration to the cities have wrought a tremendous reduction in the farm force. Right now farm labor employment is at its lowest seasonal level since the Government started keeping records of it 21 years ago. The farm labor force is estimated to be 8,500,000 persons, including a little less than 7,000,000 family workers and 1,500,000 hired workers. This force is 150,000 persons below that of a year ago. This morning's newspapers carry the report of 750,000 seasonal women workers being needed to harvest 1945 crops.

Not only has the farm labor supply declined in quantity, it has also deteriorated as regards quality. Because there is so much inexperienced help on the farms, there is unprecedented breakage in the handling of farm machinery, and, furthermore, the War Production Board has recently drastically slashed the production of new farm equipment.

On the other side of the picture, the farmer is confronted with spectacular demands and is valiantly striving to meet them; 363,000,000 acres are being planted this year. The largest wheat crop ever produced in this country is forecast by the United States Department of Agriculture.

The dairy picture presents the same challenging story. Last year lend-lease deliveries of food and other agricultural products to our allies totaled seven and one-fourth billion pounds. Of this figure, dairy deliveries totaled one and three-eighths billion pounds and were second only to shipments of meat and meat products at two and one-fourth billion pounds. In 1944, out of every dollar

spent for food supplies for the armed forces and lend-lease, 15.6 cents went for dairy products. In World War No. 1 the expenditure was 2 cents. For the first time since the outbreak of the war, the staggering milk production goal of 120,000,000 pounds is expected to be met. Moreover, for the first time in history, butter is officially a part of the overseas ration of our soldiers. One of the officials of the Quartermaster Corps has said:

I see nothing in this year's prospects that the world will not require all the milk and milk products, especially butter, which can be produced.

The sentiment is echoed by Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator. In a recent letter to the chairman of the Dairy Month Committee, Judge Jones stated:

The need for dairy products both for military and civilian use will be urgent for some time to come. May I ask that the official Dairy Month Committee and the entire dairy industry again make Dairy Month the occasion for a special effort to impress upon everyone the importance of dairy products in our war effort?

The War Food Administration more than doubled the amount of creamery butter which must be set aside for Government purchase in April and May compared to that required to be set aside in February and March. The quotas will take 40 percent of all butter produced in April and 55 percent of the May output.

From all these indications and others, it is obvious that the Government, including every agency and official involved, must explore every possible phase to make available to the farmers absolutely needed help. At a recent dairy meeting held in my State, it was estimated that 2,500 more men working a 60-hour week will be required to manufacture and handle milk products during the flush period of production in Wisconsin this spring. The situation throughout the Nation reflects the same crisis in farm manpower. What is the Government going to do about it?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to be out of the Senate Chamber on naval matters until half-past 2 or 3 o'clock, and I ask to be excused.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is excused.

DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL MUSIC RELATIONSHIP AS MINISTER OF GOOD WILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, these are historic days, full of rapid-moving events.

After the death of the leader of this Nation, President Roosevelt, we had 3 days when the radio and the music lovers of America cooperated. We heard from the great organs and choirs of our churches, from the great orchestras, from the great opera singers of America, from the great musicians, instrumental and vocal. This music lifted the spirit of America. In this great outflow of harmony there was nothing that cramped the soul or stunted the intellect. Rather,

there was spiritual uplift; there was power and beauty in the experience.

We know that what the world needs is a spiritual renaissance. Hearts are hungry for more light. In the days which lie ahead every force that is constructive should be utilized to antidote the unrest, to make sure that men work for the highest type of service and not for mere expediency. We have seen—and our brethren, who are now overseas, when they come back will report to us—how, when nations sell their birthright for a mess of pottage, they descend to the level of the brute. It is for us to maintain our birthright by radiating power, the spirit of tolerance, and brotherly love, and service—the current coin of the soul.

One avenue through which this can be accomplished in music.

Music is an international language, a common bond, and is universal in expression. It will be extremely important in the preservation of lasting peace and harmony and will be of incalculable value in promoting appreciation, understanding, and good will among all nations and peoples.

The psychology and philosophy of getting music with its wealth of beauty into the minds and hearts of all peoples will have a profound effect upon the future of all mankind. To aid in the difficult periods of unrest and unsettlement, music—the right kind of music—will serve as an inspiration and also encouragement.

There is a definite relationship between mental and physical nourishment. To be most effective, both should go hand in hand.

Music, with its wealth of beauty, has always been of major importance as a common bond, language, and interest among all nations and peoples, and is universal in expression.

Mr. President, there was forwarded to me the other day a proposed plan by Mr. Allen F. H. Swanson, of Milwaukee, Wis., a program which includes international short-wave radio programs in which premiere and outstanding performances would be transmitted and others received in return.

I ask that this 10-point plan be printed in the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The plan is as follows:

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL POST-WAR MUSIC PROGRAM

TEN POINT PLAN (TENTATIVE)

(Includes radio short wave, concerts, and music productions)

1. To develop and project international music relationship as a minister of good will, appreciation, and understanding, and as a force in the preservation of peace and harmony.

2. To coordinate and concentrate all interests and efforts and assist in arrangements and program details for music productions, performances, and concerts, and to make available to all nations and peoples the music accomplishments and high standards of artistry as derived from the inherent initiative and ingenuity of the masters.

3. To arouse interest and stimulate the study of the art and science of national and international music.

4. To encourage compositions for premier performances in radio short wave and music productions, performances, and concerts.

5. To promote close unity and cooperation among all artists, music organizations, companies and educational institutions through an exchange of views and experiences on problems and issues of mutual interest.

6. To encourage the opening of new frontiers of opportunity for musicians and the expansion of music activities to countries all over the world, and to foster free enterprise.

7. To consolidate the knowledge and experiences of authorities in a central organization and to administer sound advice and recommendations.

8. To supply press, radio, magazines, posters, trade publications, and other media with news concerning progress and activities of international music developments, productions, and performances.

9. To encourage the prompt enactment of legislation which will provide sound policies and effective machinery for a permanent international music program.

10. To cooperate enthusiastically in the formulation of a basically sound and constructive music program and cooperate wholeheartedly on the broad policies essential to such sound development.

ORGANIZATION PLAN (TENTATIVE)

1. Incorporate as a nonprofit, nonstock International Music Association (organization) with at least one representative in each State and affiliations in all countries.

2. Secure finances for administrative staff through membership dues, contributions, appropriations, grants, and trust funds.

3. Set up and maintain directly and indirectly staffs of authorities in a central organization.

4. Set up and maintain a main office and representatives wherever it is deemed advisable.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this plan has received considerable notice and attention by musicians. Expressions of interest have been received from prominent musicians. I ask that this list also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Expressions of interest have been received from the following prominent musicians. This represents only a small number of the many wonderful communications:

Bruno Walter.
Vladimir Golschmann, St. Louis Symphony Orchestra.
Alfred Wallenstein, Philharmonic Orchestra of Los Angeles.
Karl Krueger, Detroit Symphony Orchestra.
Karl Wecker, Hollywood Bowl.
Leopold Stokowski.
Desire Defauw, Chicago Symphony Orchestra.

Edwin Franko Goldman, the Goldman Band.

Fabien Sevitzyk, Indianapolis Symphony Orchestra.

Carl Bricken, Seattle Symphony Orchestra.
Sigmund Spaeth.

Paul Whiteman, the Blue Network.

Frank Black, N. B. C.

Mark Warnow, C. B. S.

Harold N. Wagner, Mutual Broadcasting System.

Viola Kmetz, Zenith.

C. A. Dykstra, former president, University of Wisconsin.

C. M. Tremaine, director, National Bureau for the Advancement of Music.

Edmund Gram, past president, National Association of Music Merchants.

Bertha Foster, Musicians' Club of America.
Maj. Alf. Heiberg, chief, Bands, music branch, Special Services Division.

Herman F. Smith, past president, Music Educators' National Conference.

John C. Kendel, president, Music Educators' National Conference.

Kathleen Davison, national president, Sigma Alpha Iota.

Harold Spivacke, Chief, Music Division, Library of Congress.

Tom Connally, chairman, United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Arthur H. Vandenberg, chairman, United States Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations.

Louis G. Cowan, chief, New York office, O. W. I.

Allan F. H. Swanson.

Universities.

Music schools.

Music organizations.

National service organizations.

QUOTATIONS

"The idea of an international organization for the exchange of music and musicians is certainly one to be most ardently welcomed." (Bruno Walter.)

"Anything you can do toward the establishment of international musical activity will be decidedly worth while." (Sigmund Spaeth.)

"I can see many virtues in such a plan as you suggest and I hope may be able to realize your hopes fully." (Karl Krueger, musical director, Detroit Symphony.)

"May I wish you the very best of luck, and thank you for the privilege of hearing about your fine plans and the honor of being asked to help in this excellent work." (Carl Bricken, musical director, Seattle Symphony; past director, music department, University of Wisconsin.)

"May I congratulate you on the breadth and scope of your proposed international and post-war music program." (Lewis G. Cowan, chief, New York office, O. W. I.)

"Anyone who believes in the inherent power of music should believe in your plans." (Karl Wecker, managing director, Hollywood Bowl.)

"I find your ideas most interesting and wish all the success it deserves." (Vladimir Golschmann, conductor, St. Louis Symphony.)

"Indeed, this is a project worthy of promotion and my sincerest congratulations are extended to you." (Herman Smith, past president, Music Educators' National Conference.)

"Your ideas for an international music program seem very worth while, and I hope they will materialize." (Paul M. Ober, chairman, department of music, University of Minnesota.)

"I received your proposed plan for post-war music and believe you have an excellent thought, as music is one of the most important factors and should be included in all post-war plans." (Paul Whiteman, director of music, the Blue Network.)

"Need I say that I believe your idea for an international music program as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities is extremely worth while and will do more than its share to help in the reconstruction of friendly, harmonious relations at that time." (Mark Warnow, Columbia Broadcasting System.)

"The thoughts and proposals expressed by you are most commendable. May we take this opportunity to wish you the success you so richly deserve." (Harold Wagner, Mutual Broadcasting System.)

Mr. WILEY. Among the many letters Mr. Swanson received there is one from Leopold Stokowski. I quote one brief paragraph from it:

I feel just as you do that we should make a definite post-war program so that the moment the fighting ceases we can begin to bring beauty where there has been brutality.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

JULY 1, 1944.

DEAR MR. SWANSON: Thank you for your most interesting letter of April 8. I feel just as you do that post-war international music can be one of the quickest, simplest ways of reaching a friendly understanding between the people who are, for no fault of their own, now fighting each other.

I feel just as you do that we should make a definite post-war program so that the moment the fighting ceases we can begin to bring beauty where there has been brutality.

Your idea of an international short-wave radio program is one of the best ways of communicating with all countries, bringing beauty and inspiration to those who are depressed and in despair.

The United States has, in my opinion, the greatest orchestras in the world. We should form an orchestra of the finest elements, including all the best players and instruments, and send this orchestra to Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, South and Central America. This orchestra, through music, can express to the world the high ideals of the United States.

You write of the "rebirth of a sound and harmonious international relationship." I believe music, because it is a universal language, is an ideal medium for this rebirth.

In my opinion, our way of doing all this should be—

1. To think out everything clearly.
2. To form an organization having a center in New York or Washington and representatives in every State of the Union.
3. To act swiftly and without meaningless formalities so that our ideas do not remain merely ideas but become facts and dynamic realities.

If I have any contribution to these great ideas, it is in the field of symphonic music. I shall be happy to work with enthusiasm in this field.

Sincerely,

LEOPOLD STOKOWSKI.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, God has planted in man the beauty of holiness. Let us resurrect it in the days up ahead. As man grasps this fact and lives it, then will brutality and war disappear. Music will aid him to arrive.

THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, it will be remembered by the Congress and the public generally that during the latter part of 1943 and throughout 1944 certain Government officials, led by the ever-aggressive and power-hungry Secretary of the Interior, had a great deal to say about the United States running out of oil. Magazine articles, addresses, radio speeches, press releases, posters, slogans, and propaganda of all kinds were employed to keep this theme of fear and intimidation constantly before the people to the end that the road of our expanding bureaucracy to statism might be made less difficult.

In March of last year I pointed out to the Congress that since 1941 the petroleum industry has faced a severe shortage of material, equipment, and manpower, but notwithstanding these handicaps, the industry, through new discoveries and extension of old pools, closed the year 1943 with estimated known reserves of 20,064,000,000 barrels, as compared with 20,082,600,000 barrels at the close of 1942; only 18,600,000 barrels dif-

ference, or slightly more than 4½ days' production at the 1944 rate.

I desire to call the attention of Congress again to the splendid and incomparable record of the petroleum industry for the year 1944. The petroleum industry was called upon to produce a greater quantity of oil in 1944 than ever before in its history. Total production during the last calendar year reached the all-time high of 1,678,421,000 barrels. This magnificent performance was accomplished under the severe handicaps of inadequate prices imposed by an arbitrary and dictatorial O. P. A. and severe shortages of material, equipment, and manpower.

The point I desire to make, however, and one which continues fully and completely to answer the scare talk that we are running out of oil, is that despite the peak production of the last calendar year, the American oil industry closed 1944 with total known reserves of 20,453,231,000 barrels, or a 389,079,000-barrel increase in reserves since December 31, 1943. These figures are from the American Petroleum Institute's committee on petroleum reserves, and represent the considered judgment of the best scientific minds engaged in the petroleum business.

The record of the petroleum industry during the strain of the war years is an accomplishment in which every American can take pride.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A vacancy exists on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. It is a so-called Republican vacancy, and the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has recommended that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] be appointed to fill the vacancy on the Commission. The Chair, therefore, appoints the Senator from Illinois as a member of the Commission.

CONDOLENCE ON DEATH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Counselor of the Irish Legation at Washington, D. C., embodying a resolution adopted by Seanad Eireann, in session in Dublin on April 18, 1945, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRISH LEGATION,

Washington, D. C., April 23, 1945.

The Honorable KENNETH McKELLAR,

President of the Senate.

SIR: In the absence of the Minister, I have the honor to transmit herewith the text of a resolution passed by Seanad Eireann in session in Dublin on April 18, 1945:

"Resolved, That Seanad Eireann extends its deep sympathy to the Government and people of the United States of America in the great loss they have sustained in the death of President Roosevelt."

Very truly yours,

SEAN NUNAN,
Counselor of Legation

TAXATION OF THE COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, transmitting copy of a memorandum relative

to proposed legislation to prohibit the taxation of the compensation of Federal employees by any State other than the State of domicile, prepared by the assistant attorney general of Hawaii, which, with the accompanying memorandum, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRITORY OF HAWAII,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, April 17, 1945.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Supplementing my letter of April 11, 1945, with reference to the pendency in the Senate of H. R. 534, I enclose herewith for your information copy of a memorandum relative to the subject matter of this bill which has been prepared by the assistant attorney general.

Sincerely,

INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of Hawaii.

MEMORANDUM RE H. R. 534, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

This bill proposes to prohibit the taxation of the compensation of Federal employees by any State other than the State of domicile. The bill would apply not only to employees of the United States itself but also to those of the Territories and the District of Columbia.

1. THE BILL ADOPTS THE WRONG METHOD OF ELIMINATING DUPLICATE TAXATION

The Supreme Court of the United States has held that earnings may be taxed where the services are rendered or by the domiciliary State. Thus duplicate taxation is legally possible, but as a matter of policy it should be avoided. However, the method of avoiding duplicate taxation proposed by this bill is the wrong method.

According to a study made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the 32 States (including Hawaii) which impose an income tax, may be divided into three groups, as follows: (a) Twenty States provide for the elimination of duplicate taxation by allowing the residents of the taxing State a credit or deduction on account of tax liability to the State in which the income is earned. This may be a credit against the domiciliary State's tax, a provision for deduction from that State's tax base of income taxed elsewhere, a provision that business carried on outside the State is not taxable, or, as in the case of Hawaii, a provision that compensation earned elsewhere is not taxable if subjected to tax by any other jurisdiction, irrespective of the amount of the tax. Such States and Territories are: Arkansas, California, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, the city of Philadelphia in the State of Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Virginia. One additional State, New Mexico, allows a partial credit. (b) Six States provide for the taxation of the earnings of nonresidents within the State and also the earnings of residents wherever made, without allowing any credit for taxes of other jurisdictions; these six States do not make any provision to eliminate duplicate taxation. Such States are Alabama, Arizona, Louisiana, Minnesota, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin. (c) Only five States follow the theory that the State of domicile has the prior right of taxation. These States either base their tax solely on the income of residents, nonresidents not being taxed at all, or else they allow a credit to nonresidents for taxes paid to the State of domicile, on a reciprocal basis. Such States are Delaware, Massachusetts, New York, Utah, and South Carolina.

It thus appears that H. R. 534, in following the theory that the State of domicile has the prior right of taxation, is in line with only 5 out of 32 States having income taxes. The great majority of the States have adopted the view that the State where compensation is earned has the prior right of taxation, and to avoid duplicate taxation these States exempt residents with respect to income taxed elsewhere, or credit them for taxes paid elsewhere. This is the method which should be followed in H. R. 534. The bill should be amended so as to provide that:

1. The State or Territory in which compensation is earned by a Federal employee shall have the prior right to tax such compensation; and

2. The domiciliary jurisdiction may tax such compensation if the laws thereof provide for deduction from the tax base of income upon which a tax has been actually paid to the State or Territory wherein it was earned, or for a credit against the domiciliary tax on account of taxes actually paid to the State or Territory in which such compensation was earned.

Such a provision would afford relief to residents of States which now have no provision exempting their residents with respect to income taxes elsewhere, or crediting them for taxes paid elsewhere. It is these States which are out of line, and not the Territory of Hawaii.

The method of eliminating duplicate taxation above proposed not only represents the majority view of the several States but also is the sound view. The State or Territory in which compensation is earned should be recognized to have the prior right of taxation inasmuch as (1) taxes are more readily collectible in the place in which the taxpayer actually is to be found, and in many instances the domiciliary jurisdiction would not be able to collect taxes from its citizens after their absence from the State for many years; and (2) the presence of workers within a State or Territory increases the cost of government therein whether or not they become citizens of such jurisdiction, and it is not fair to require the citizens of such jurisdiction to bear the cost of government for the noncitizens. These points are further developed below.

2. H. R. 534 IN ITS PRESENT FORM WOULD LEAD TO WHOLESALE TAX EVASION

This bill provides that each Federal employee shall make a declaration of his domicile within 60 days after a written demand for payment of the tax shall have been received by him. This would mean that the tax officials of each State would have to ascertain who among the Federal employees had not made tax returns and then make written demand upon each of them for payment of the tax. In Hawaii alone there are 100,000 civil employees of the Federal Government. The number of such written demands which would be necessary would make it necessary to add personnel for this purpose and the cost would not be justified since the demand would produce nothing better than a disclaimer of local domicile. To dispute this declaration by the Federal employee concerned the tax official would have to litigate the matter in the Federal court. The facts as to domicile are peculiarly within the knowledge of the individual concerned, and it is largely a matter of intention. Some Federal employees who have resided in the Territory year after year still disclaim local domicile. The number of cases involved would be enormous. Hence if this bill were passed there would be no practical possibility of collecting Territorial taxes from any Federal employee who was not ready and willing to pay such taxes. Tax payment by Federal employees would be placed on a purely voluntary basis.

The taxes which Hawaii could not collect would not be collectible elsewhere. It would not be practical for the State in which the

employee actually was domiciled to follow the employee outside the State, or to ascertain the date of his return after an absence possibly extending into several years and at that late date determine his tax liability and collect the tax. Moreover, many persons go from State to State wherever work can be found and their domicile would be difficult to determine. If this bill is to pass, at the very least the burden of securing the declaration of domicile and verifying the same should rest with the Federal Government, which has access to the personnel records of each employee; and the Federal Government should inform the State in which the employee is performing the service and the State declared by him to be his domicile, of the declaration made.

3. THE STATE IN WHICH A NONRESIDENT WORKER IS PERFORMING SERVICES HAS A BETTER RIGHT OF TAXATION THAN THE DOMICILIARY JURISDICTION

As above noted the great majority of States follow the theory that the State in which services are actually performed has a better right of taxation than the domiciliary jurisdiction. This is true not only from the practical standpoint of the collectibility of the tax but also as a matter of fairness to the State in which the nonresident worker is sojourning. An increase in population necessarily increases the cost of government, whether or not the immigrant worker becomes a citizen of the State to which he comes. The increase in the civilian population of Oahu is estimated at 41,500 during the period from June 30, 1941 to June 30, 1944. As this increased population is directly traceable to the presence of immigrant war workers it will be seen that they represent a very substantial part of the present population which was estimated at 342,106 as of June 30, 1944. These population figures do not include some 20,000 workers residing in Federal housing areas who nevertheless come to town regularly and play a large part in the overcrowding of local facilities other than housing.

The appropriations for the health department exemplify the increased burden on local government imposed by the above described situation. During the 1939-41 biennium the general appropriation for the Health Department was \$745,159; for the 1941-43 biennium, \$1,189,056; for the 1943-45 biennium, \$1,708,155; and for the 1945-47 biennium the budget sent to the senate by the house of representatives calls for \$2,096,033 for this department. The above figures indicate the expanded needs of the health department to meet the increased health problems in this community. Some of these problems are due to the overcrowding of housing facilities and eating and drinking places; this overcrowding is particularly serious in respect to the control of communicable diseases such as tuberculosis, colds, typhus fever and dengue fever.

In many instances the effect of the presence of the war workers in the community can be directly traced. Thus, Dr. M. F. Haralson on September 11, 1941, in his report to Mr. S. L. Platt, special secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, stated that of the last 100 admissions to the mental hygiene clinic up to the time of that report, 30 were connected with defense activities and had been in Hawaii less than 1 year. Fifteen of the 30 were defense workers or members of their families, 8 were Navy officers, 2 were Navy enlisted men, 1 was from the Army and 4 were mainland "floaters" attracted to the Territory by defense jobs. Since the date of that report there has been a tremendous increase in the migrant population of the Territory.

In tuberculosis control, the chest clinic of the health department has repeatedly examined and recommended treatment and follow-up of many war workers referred by physicians and others. The mobile X-ray

unit of the health department has been used to X-ray the chests of all food handlers in the naval housing area, 4,500 people in the Hawaii Air Depot area; and all U. S. E. D. employees have been X-rayed twice in the 2-year period. Plans are being made to X-ray all the war workers and their families in the naval and Hawaiian Air Depot housing areas.

With respect to housing it repeatedly has occurred that workers brought in for Federal projects and furnished with accommodations in barracks have moved into town taking up housing accommodations in the city. Although this is a problem for which the Federal Government is responsible it is only since the recent visit of the Subcommittee on Congested Areas of the House Naval Affairs Committee that there has been a good prospect of relief of this situation by the Federal Government. Meanwhile the Territory has expended, or encumbered for contracts now being performed, the sum of \$725,000 for the local housing committee and for temporary housing. This expenditure cannot be amortized over the period of the life of the buildings and does not represent a capital investment.

With respect to crime control the effect of immigrant war workers is obvious. Not only do they constitute a substantial part of the population, but moreover they are not a stable element. This is necessarily true of any migrant group. Insofar as there is any relation between the domicile of the persons present within the Territory and the problems of crime control, the cost of government in this regard is increased, not decreased, by the impermanent character of this portion of the population.

Other costs of government which are increased by the presence of nonresident workers are for fire protection, public parks, libraries, roads, and in fact every cost of government. The bill would apply to Federal employees even if they had their families with them, so long as they declared that they eventually intended to return to the States from which they originally came.

The foregoing arguments apply equally to Federal employees residing on Federal reservations. Congress previously provided for taxation of their earnings by the Buck Act, (54 Stat. 1059, ch. 787, sec. 2 (a)), and the position then taken was sound. So far as the employee is concerned it makes no difference to him whether certain services are furnished him by the local government or by the Federal Government; that is a question which concerns only Congress and the several States. Since all Federal property is non-taxable it is only fair that Congress should say, as it did say in the Buck Act, that it does not claim tax exemptions for Federal employees residing on the reservations by reason of the fact that some of the Government services involved are furnished by the Federal Government in such cases.

4. ESTIMATE OF TERRITORIAL TAX REVENUE INVOLVED

Based on the present tax laws, the number of Federal employees in the Territory in 1944, and their rates of pay in that year, the Tax Commissioner estimates the territorial tax revenue involved as \$3,500,000 per year. This figure includes all Federal employees, as it is not possible to determine the number who consider their legal domicile elsewhere than in the Territory of Hawaii. Federal employees represent approximately 30 percent of the total number of persons employed in the Territory.

5. APPLICATION OF THE BILL TO TERRITORIAL EMPLOYEES

The bill should not apply to employees of the territories. So far as Hawaii is concerned, this Territory itself has taken proper steps to protect its residents from duplicate taxation, and as above noted the method used by Hawaii is the method used by the majority

of the States. Hawaii needs no special legislation by Congress in this regard.

Respectfully submitted.

RHODA V. LEWIS,
Assistant Attorney General, Territory
of Hawaii.

Approved:

C. NILS TAVARES,
Attorney General of Hawaii.
WM. BORTHWICK,
Tax Commissioner, Territory of Hawaii.
Dated April 13, 1945.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 23, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 105) to extend the life of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as follows:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:
A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact H. R. 2347, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to guayule rubber

"Whereas guayule rubber is being successfully grown in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and the United States Bureau of Plant Industry is carrying on extensive research in crossing this plant with harder plants so that guayule may be grown under less limited climatic conditions; and

"Whereas the need for a native rubber supply has been well demonstrated during this war; and

"Whereas the growing of guayule presents tremendous possibilities as a post-war industry; and

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress H. R. 2347, introduced by Congressman POAGE, to provide and insure a dependable supply of domestic and natural rubber, to provide for the continuation of research work in this field, and to authorize a guaranteed floor price for rubber produced by farmers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2347 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to guayule rubber; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"Whereas the people of Hawaii feel anew their identity with the people of the 48 States in the grief and shock caused by the sudden death of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and

"Whereas the momentous consequences to the whole world of the death of the great advocate of international cooperation are beyond the possibility of appraisal; and

"Whereas in the passing of the President, whose fame and record of leadership and achievement in national and international affairs will live eternally in the pages of American history, this Nation, in common with all peace-loving nations of the world, has suffered a great and irreparable loss; and

"Whereas it is most fitting that the people of Hawaii, stricken and stunned by this

tragic blow, should, together with the rest of the Nation, pause to bow in tribute to the memory of an illustrious leader, in whose heart burned fiercely an all-consuming desire to accomplish the utter destruction of the evil forces which have brought untold misery, suffering, and sorrow into this world and the establishment of international unity for the maintenance of a just and enduring peace, and mourn the untimely passing on of that leader into history at a time when his guidance was most sorely needed and, in consolation, to glory in the magnitude of his accomplishments gained under the most trying conditions and in the most critical period of the Nation's history: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (sitting in joint session), That the profound grief of the people of Hawaii upon the death of the President be hereby recorded; and be it further

"Resolved, That the recognition by the people of Hawaii of the fact that the President, while serving his country in the highest office within the gift of the Nation, was a heroic casualty of war no less than if he had died in combat on the field of battle, be hereby expressed; and be it further

"Resolved, That the people of Hawaii, in common with the rest of the Nation, in recognition of this great loss and of the increased necessity of unity, do hereby dedicate themselves to meet the continuing dangers and difficulties in the conduct of the war and in the peace to follow with renewed determination and singleness of purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That the people of Hawaii do hereby express their aloha nui loa and deepest sympathy to the members of the family of the late President in their hour of sorrow and bereavement."

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Croatian Catholic Union of the United States of America, a national American fraternal benefit society, Gary, Ind., expressing deep sorrow on the death of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and also expressing confidence and loyalty to the new Chief Executive, Hon. Harry S. Truman; ordered to lie on the table.

TARIFF DUTIES ON PLATE GLASS AND ZINC

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for print in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter I have received from Verner R. Waters, of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Topeka, Kans., expressing his emphatic opposition to the enactment of legislation proposing to extend the Reciprocity Act which would give the President the right to reduce further tariff duties on plate glass, and other articles which are made in this country; and also a letter from James L. Smith, of the Baxter Chat Co., Baxter Springs, Kans., opposing further Executive authority to reduce tariff rates.

There being no objection, the letters were received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO.,

Topeka, Kans., April 17, 1945.

SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER,

The United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you relative to H. R. 2652, which has to do with extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. As I understand it, the bill would extend this act for 3 more years and give the President the right to further reduce tariff duties on the

articles which we make. We are against this extension and I do hope you will do everything you can to prevent its becoming law.

You well know that the window glass business, in which I am engaged, could be seriously injured by too much foreign competition. Labor costs about 20 to 25 cents per hour in Belgium, while we pay American workers from \$1.25 to \$1.56 per hour. That alone, it seems, should justify continuing our tariff.

Because everything in our business is changing we don't quite understand how anyone can tell what costs are going to be after the war. If they are not known how can a tariff rate be changed sensibly?

You will remember too, that Czechoslovakia and Belgium together have greater window glass capacity than we have, not to mention the capacities of Japan and Russia.

I hope you will actively oppose any extension of this Reciprocity Act especially if it is for more than 1 year and if it contains the power to further reduce tariff rates.

Yours very truly,

VERNER R. WATERS.

THE BAXTER CHAT CO.,

Baxter Springs, Kans., April 20, 1945.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senator from Kansas,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing herewith an article taken from our local paper which more or less will give you a slant on what might happen if the tariff on zinc is further reduced by giving the President authority in the reciprocal trade agreements to arbitrarily reduce tariff on zinc.

While the zinc industry in Kansas covers a very small portion of your district some of the richest zinc mines in the entire district are within the State of Kansas. Our labor here is all native. There are no foreign laborers; neither are there any colored miners. The wages are relatively high, the men are intelligent and have a high standard of living. We do not want to see this condition change.

I know that you are in sympathy with our side of this problem and hope that you will make an effort to convince some of your colleagues that there should be no change.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES L. SMITH.

ADMINISTRATOR OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., Grand Forks, N. Dak., endorsing John M. Carmody as

Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNKOTA POWER COOPERATIVE, INC., GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.—RESOLUTION FOR AN R. E. A. ADMINISTRATOR

Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration is now functioning without an administrator head; and

Whereas, conditions existing at this time require the appointment of a powerful, capable, and experienced head at the earliest possible date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this cooperative endorse the name of John M. Carmody; and be it further

Resolved, That such action as may be deemed appropriate be authorized for the furthering of such recommendation.

REESTABLISHMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., of Grand Forks, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 309, to reestablish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNKOTA POWER COOPERATIVE, INC., GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.—RESOLUTION FOR R. E. A. INDEPENDENCE

Whereas it has long been stated that the Rural Electrification Administration no longer operates in accordance with the law which provides for its administration; and

Whereas such charges have been substantiated beyond reasonable question by the findings of the subcommittee of the Senate Agricultural Committee charged with the duty of investigating the administration of the Rural Electrification Administration; and

Whereas the Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., as a cooperative which has been financed by means of funds made available through the Rural Electrification Administration has evidence from its own experience to support the findings and charges of the subcommittee; and

Whereas the Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., believes that unless corrective measures are taken immediately the future welfare of the entire rural electrification program stands to be jeopardized: Now, therefore, be it

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

MARCH 31, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the

names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of March 1945, in compliance with the terms

Resolved, That this cooperative endorse Senate bill 309 and H. R. 1505; and be it further

Resolved, That it take such action as is deemed necessary and expedient toward the gain of that end.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 612. A bill to amend the National Defense Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of provisions for retirement of wing commanders of the Air Corps; with amendments (Rept. No. 201).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 881. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell; without amendment (Rept. No. 202).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 889. A bill to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, so as to authorize credit to students now or hereafter enrolled in the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps for military training received while on active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, or while pursuing a course of instruction in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 203).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY A COMMITTEE WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of March 1945 from the chairman of the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Virginia W. Boyce	3810 W St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.	\$1,800
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,000
Hope C. Heslep	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Charles Kramer	4621 South 34th St., Arlington, Va.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,500
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Fritzle P. Mannel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Darel McConkey	Lanham, Md.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	8,000
Marjorie J. Tillis	211 Delaware Ave. SW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,200

H. M. KILGORE, Chairman.

INSPECTION OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT
BY NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of two resolutions which were ordered favorably reported today from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I inquire, what are the resolutions?

Mr. LUCAS. One is Senate Resolution 48, the other Senate Resolution 87. Senate Resolution 48 was submitted by the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], on January 25. The resolution provides for an appropriation of \$4,000 to inspect certain naval bases within the Western Hemisphere. I wish to say for the Naval Affairs Committee that during last year the committee spent little or nothing in making investigations. The Senator from Massachusetts has not pressed very strongly for action on the resolution. He said to me about 3 weeks ago that he thought it ought to be agreed to. It was reported favorably by the Naval Affairs Committee, and was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which ordered it favorably reported today.

I now ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 48, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 48) submitted by Mr. WALSH on January 25, 1945, and previously reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, during the present Congress, any part of the Naval Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed \$4,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. The members of such committee or subcommittee shall be paid the actual expenses of transportation incurred by them for travel performed under the provisions of this resolution and a per diem allowance as provided by law while performing travel authorized by this resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in addition to what the Senator from Illinois has stated, I wish to say that this is largely a formal matter. For several years past a fund has been allowed the committee, but practically no money whatever has been expended. Many members of the committee, including myself, have made inspections at our personal expense amounting at times to several hundred dollars; but I think circumstances may arise under which members of the committee ought to make official inspections, and the money ought to be available for the purpose.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

DISPOSAL OF THE GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST IN THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEAN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the second resolution I desire to present to the Senate for consideration is Senate resolution 87, which was submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] on February 26 and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, was favorably reported with an amendment by that committee, and then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and was ordered reported by that committee favorably today. We have made one change in the amount of money requested. \$5,000 was requested. The committee thought perhaps \$3,000 was sufficient to carry on the investigation. An amendment to that effect has been recommended.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably with an additional amendment from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 87, and I ask for its present consideration.

The committee was also unanimous in its belief—and I wish to report this to the Senate—that the resolution which was referred originally to the Committee on the Judiciary should have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because it involved an R. F. C. matter, and the Committee on Banking and Currency has handled all such matters.

Mr. WHITE. I think there is a presumption in favor of any resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Maine for the presumption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. McKellar on February 26, 1945, and previously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 1, line 4, after the word "surrounding", to strike out "the transaction in January 1937, involving."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the circumstances surrounding the disposal of the Government's interest in the Nashville Tennessean, a newspaper published in Nashville, Tenn., with particular regard

to the part played in such transaction by employees or former employees of the Government, and to report thereon to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with its recommendations, including recommendations for necessary legislation in connection with such transactions. If in the course of the investigation facts are disclosed which indicate that the interests of the United States were not properly protected or that any violation of law may have occurred, and the committee is of the opinion that the sale should be set aside or other legal proceedings instituted, it shall transmit its findings to the Attorney General with such recommendations for action as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ray S. Berrum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 916. A bill to remove the limitation on the right to command of officers of the Dental Corps of the Army which limits such officers to command in that corps; and

S. 917. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 918. A bill granting a pension to Clara V. Crossland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Nellie Bell Vernon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 920. A bill to fix the salaries of certain judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 921. A bill to authorize the transfer of Fort Schuyler Military Reservation, N. Y., to the State of New York for nautical education purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 922. A bill for the relief of Margaret G. Clancy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 923. A bill to create a Natural Resources Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 924. A bill to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish and game, and for other purposes"; to the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

On motion by Mr. SHIPSTEAD, and by unanimous consent, it was—

Ordered, That the following papers filed with the bill (S. 2051, 77th Cong.), entitled "A bill for the relief of John F. Patterson,"

be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon; Affidavit of Walter H. Barnacle, January 7, 1933;

Certification of State of Minnesota adjutant general's office, dated November 26, 1932, including Fatterson's service record, etc.;

Affidavit of Barndt A. Anderson, January 6, 1933;

Affidavit of Col. Erie D. Luce, January 5, 1933; and

Affidavit of John F. Patterson, January 17, 1933.

PRINTING OF FOURTH INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT (S. DOC. NO. 40)

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, we find that a very unusual thing has happened in connection with the Senate proceedings. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated as President of the United States on the 20th day of January this year. His inaugural address, together with the invocation and benediction delivered on that occasion, have never been put in document form, which is the result of an oversight on the part of both the House and the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the inaugural address, together with the invocation and benediction delivered on that occasion, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTAL PAY—EDITORIAL FROM FARGO (N. DAK.) FORUM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Postal Pay," published in the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum of April 15, 1945. It is one of the best and clearest and most concise editorials on the subject of postal pay I have ever read.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL PAY

Your postman and the other employees in the United States Postal Service are asking for your assistance. They are asking the folks they serve to help them get a raise in wages.

Should they have a raise in wages? They make out a strong case. Twenty years ago, under President Calvin Coolidge, the mailman's salary was raised from a maximum of \$1,800 to a maximum of \$2,100 annually. There has been no fixed increase in pay since.

They are now getting a temporary bonus of \$25 a month, but this \$300 a year will expire June 30 unless Congress extends it.

Bills are pending before Congress that would grant the postman and all other postal employees a permanent \$400 a year increase. In view of the steep increase in living costs since 1925, a raise of \$33 a month would seem to be a fair and moderate request.

Postmen and other postal employees have homes to keep up, families to raise, children to educate.

Is there a more faithful public servant in America than your postman who trudges to your door every week day, rain or shine, sleet storm or blizzard, in the sizzling heat of summer and through the blasts of winter?

Recently the New York Daily Mirror made a plea for justice for the postman. Said the Mirror:

"Who is this postal worker whose income barely provides him with a worrisome subsistence? Is he one of the army of bureaucrats who infest Washington and the Nation to the number of 3,000,000?"

Everyone in America knows the answer to that one. These postal employees are true civil servants. They are not the pets of the New Deal. Compared to the compensation paid to employees in many of these new bureaucratic organizations these old-time servants of the Government have been and are being shamefully treated.

Bills have been before Congress providing fair compensation for the postal employees for a long time. They were before the last Congress. It was generally agreed if the measures had come to a vote they would have been passed. But at the last minute they were callously kicked out on a technicality.

The postmen can do little about it. Their hands are tied. Under the Hatch Act they cannot mix in politics. They point out that they cannot strike, and wouldn't want to if they could. They have no recourse to arbitration, mediation, or negotiation.

All they can do is to appeal to the public to use its influence with Congress. If you think your postman and his fellow employees have a just cause, you could help by writing to some member of the North Dakota delegation in Washington and telling him how you feel about it.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY UNDER A FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Full Employment and Social Security Under a Free Enterprise System," delivered by him April 20, 1945, before the St. Louis chapter of the Missouri Association for Social Welfare and the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

A TIME FOR REDEDICATION TO DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Time for Rededication to Democracy," delivered by him at a forum meeting of the National Democratic Club, on January 27, 1945, in New York, together with the introductory remarks, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT—BY JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late President Roosevelt delivered by John Bell Williams at memorial services for President Roosevelt held at the Raymond Baptist Church, Raymond, Miss., Sunday, April 15, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAZI ATROCITIES—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "America Must Not Forget—Again," dealing with Nazi atrocities, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO A GREAT LADY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To a Great Lady," in tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt, published in the Washington News of April 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ERNIE PYLE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Ernie Pyle," by Dolores Espinosa, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

had passed a bill (H. R. 2839) to increase the salary of the executive secretary of the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 122. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets, of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended;

S. 123. An act to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended;

S. 124. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924;

S. 638. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a, and providing for the recording of veterans' discharge certificates;

H. R. 2122. An act to extend to June 30, 1946, the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits;

H. R. 2687. An act to grant the honorary rank of colonel to Edward J. Kelly, major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police Force of the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2839) to increase the salary of the executive secretary of the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the legislature of my State, which is now in session, will tomorrow evening have a joint session at which memorial services will be held for the late President Roosevelt. I have accepted an invitation from the legislature to address the body on that occasion. With that explanation, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I may be excused from attendance for the purpose I have named.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Florida will be excused from attendance for the reason he has assigned.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2625) to extend the

Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Mitchell
Austin	Gurney	Moore
Bankhead	Hart	Morse
Bilbo	Hatch	Murdock
Brewster	Hawkes	Murray
Bridges	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Burton	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bushfield	Hill	Reed
Butler	Hoey	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capper	La Follette	Smith
Chandler	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tunnell
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Wagner
Eastland	McMahon	Walsh
Ellender	Magnuson	White
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Gerry	Millikin	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent visiting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent attending the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent attending committee meetings and public business pertaining to their respective States.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] for himself and other Senators to the bill H. R. 2625.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has the floor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Yesterday, during the debate, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested that the word "combat" be inserted before the word "vessels" in line 4, on page 2, of the redrafted amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of himself and other Senators. The Senator from Tennessee is willing to accept that modification, and I suggest that it be made now so as to make the record clear.

Mr. STEWART. I am willing to make the modification suggested. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made the suggestion yesterday.

Mr. WALSH. The modification will be made in line 4, on page 2, to insert the word "combat" before the word "vessels."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has the right to modify his amendment accordingly.

Mr. STEWART. That modification is acceptable.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia will yield to the Senator from Tennessee, so the Senator from Tennessee may at this time read to the Senate his amendment, as modified, in line with the statements which have just been made. Several changes have been made in the amendment since it was first offered, and it would be well if the Senate were advised of the language the Senator from Tennessee now proposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President. I intended to read the amendment as it now is, but I am glad to have the Senator from Tennessee do so.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I will say for the benefit of the acting majority leader that there was placed on the desk of each Senator this morning a reprint of the amendment with all the modifications that were accepted yesterday. I shall be glad to read the amendment in its present form, or ask that it be read at the desk, if that is considered to be necessary. There will be no change in the amendment which now is printed and

lies on the desks of Senators except for the insertion of the word "combat" before the word "vessels" in line 4, on page 2. That is the modification to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] referred, as being in line with the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] yesterday. I am willing to accept that modification, and I understand that my colleagues who joined with me in offering the amendment are agreeable to the modification.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama is anxious to have the amendment as it now stands read, let me say that I intend to read it at the beginning of my statement.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator intends to read the amendment, I shall not ask to have it read.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, for several days we have discussed the extension of the Selective Training and Service Act, and particularly an amendment to it which deals with the training of 18-year-old inductees. The amendment which we are now considering, in its present form, reads as follows:

SEC. —. Section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "And provided further, That no man under 19 years of age who is inducted into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act shall be ordered into actual combat service until after he has been given at least 6 months of military training of such character and to the extent necessary to prepare such inductee for combat duty; this proviso shall not be construed as preventing the assignment of enlisted men of the Navy or Coast Guard and the reserve components thereof to duty for training on combat vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard and at naval bases beyond the continental limits of the United States."

To me the language of the amendment is quite clear. Its meaning is simple. A fixed limitation would be placed upon the military and naval authorities with respect to inductees under 19, requiring at least 6 months' training before they are ordered into combat service. The reason for legislation upon this particular subject is that the military itself has changed its policy. Later I intend to go back and briefly summarize the history of the Selective Training and Service Act, but suffice it to say that as recently as June 7, 1944, General McNarney, Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army, and then, I believe, the Acting Chief of Staff, announced publicly that—

The Army today is not sending men under 19 years of age assigned to the infantry for overseas service.

Later that policy was revised to include men assigned to the armored forces. So in June 1944 it was the policy of the War Department that no boy under 19 years of age was sent into the infantry as a replacement, and no boy under 19 years of age was placed in an armored division.

Then, on December 7, 1944, Mr. Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, made a public statement revoking that policy. In War Times, which is a weekly official

publication of the War Department, published at the direction of the Secretary of War, we find this item on page 2 of the issue of December 8, 1944:

The necessity for Infantry and armored-force replacements has forced the Army to change its policy of withholding men under 19 years of age from active battle fronts, Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson disclosed in his press conference yesterday. The Under Secretary stated, however, that 8 months, including his period of training, intervened between a man's induction into the Army and his going into combat. Under no circumstances is a soldier sent into an active sector until he has received adequate training, and examinations have proved his physical condition equal to the hardships of combat service.

Thus, we see that in June the Acting Chief of Staff of the Army made the public announcement that no boy under 19 years of age was being sent into combat as an Infantry replacement, and later that none were being sent into the armored forces. Then, in December, we see the War Department changing that policy. The policy stated in the item which I have just read, namely, that 8 months elapsed between the time of induction and going into battle, has not been followed, and has not been complied with in all cases, as stated in this press release. I intend to bring out that fact by individual cases.

Mr. President, legislation upon the subject of training is nothing new. There is nothing novel in it. As a matter of fact, our Government is the only one of the Allied governments, with the possible exception of China, which has not legislated upon this very subject.

Great Britain has a definite provision in its draft law that no boy shall be sent out of the British Isles in any department of the service until he is 18 years and 6 months old—not that he shall have 6 months' training but that he shall not be sent out of the British Isles, even for training elsewhere, until he is 18 years and 6 months of age.

In Canada the boys are not sent out until they are 19 years of age. Moreover, up until last December, they did not go abroad to fight the enemy in Europe unless they volunteered to do so. It is interesting to note that when that policy was changed, even as late as December 1944, the number of the contingent sent abroad was fixed by statute at 16,000.

No boy may leave Australia for service abroad until he is 19 years of age.

In New Zealand, which is one of our allies, no boy may leave the shores of his country to fight a foreign enemy until he is 21 years of age.

Russia's conscription act fixes the ages between 19 and 50. It is possible that Russia has called up boys under 19; but Russia was invaded. Her land was being marched over. She grabbed anyone she could to fight in defense of her territory. Russia armed her defenders in any way they could be armed; but she had a fixed policy of law as to the age of those who might be sent into combat.

The United States alone, of all the Allied countries, has not taken such a step. So the legislation proposed is not novel, Mr. President. It is rather novel that we have not acted before. I believe

that this Government owes a duty to those whom it has called into service to take as much action for their protection as the government of any of Allied countries has taken.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I wish to say to the Senator that I am in hearty accord with the proposed amendment, and I expect to vote for it; but I wonder why the words "under 19 years of age" were included. Should there not be a requirement that 6 months' training be given every inductee, regardless of his age?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The question is very definitely a fair one. So far as I am concerned, I believe that any inductee of any age should be given 6 months' training. But I wish to point out that, as a practical matter, most of the soldiers, sailors, and marines who will be brought into service in the armed forces by way of induction from now on probably will be of the 18-year-old class. Also, I am thoroughly impressed with the fact that often there is a considerable difference between the development of an 18-year-old boy and that of a 19-year-old boy. Of course, that is not always so; but boys in their late teens develop rapidly. I believe the average boy 19 years old is much more mature, both physically and mentally, than the average 18-year-old boy. The training which is given such a boy after he is inducted is for the purpose of equipping him to be a good fighter and at the same time to take care of himself, because a wounded or dead soldier is not effective in fighting for the cause of his country.

There has been a great deal of discussion to the effect that the thing to do is to give these inductees some basic training for a few weeks, by which they may get acquainted with their guns, and then finish their training in actual battle, beside seasoned troops. First, let me point out that today soldiers very seldom go into battle in mass formation. Usually they are scattered or are fighting in small groups, sometimes groups composed of only two men. I am not very much impressed with the idea of giving a boy a small amount of training to begin with and then sending him into combat beside a seasoned soldier, because under such circumstances not only would he be a menace to himself, but he would be a menace to the seasoned, trained trooper who would have to look out for him.

This subject first came up at the time when the Senate was considering the extension or amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act to include 18-year-old and 19-year-old boys. That was in October 1942. At that time the same subject we are discussing today was debated. I wish to point out that in the Senate it was agreed that no boy under 20 years of age should be sent abroad until he had received a year's training. That policy was adopted by the Senate in 1942. Provision for it was taken out of the bill in conference. Then, as now, the military leaders begged that no restrictions be placed upon them, but at that time the Senate felt that a

restriction should be placed upon them, and the Senate so acted.

Today we are only requesting that these young men be given at least 6 months' training before they are placed in actual combat, and that the 6 months' training be given anywhere, so long as it is effective and will train them to be good fighters and enable them to take care of themselves.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe I have a thought which will appeal to the Senator. The pending amendment reads in part as follows:

And provided further, That no man under 19 years of age who is inducted into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act shall be ordered into actual combat service.

A few minutes ago the Senator made a very fine point in regard to Russia. I think his position is extremely well taken.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe the amendment will receive much more endorsement if its sponsors adopt the suggestion I am about to make. Of course, Russia called upon her boys and her women, and we would call upon our boys or our women or anyone else in this country to defend this Nation if it were attacked and if the combat were brought to our shores.

So I suggest that the amendment be modified at that point so as to read:

Shall be ordered into actual combat service outside the territorial limits of the United States.

Such a modification would provide for any eventualities in case our Nation were attacked. Of course, today we do not expect it to be attacked. However, under the modification I have suggested, if it were attacked any 18-year-old boy or anyone else who had received any kind of training could be ordered by the military leaders into actual service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator for presenting the suggestion; but, with all due deference to him, I do not think it is necessary to include in the amendment the words he has suggested, because regardless of any law which might be enacted, if this country were invaded the result would be the same as that which occurred in Russia, namely, we would call into the service everyone who could bear arms, regardless of age.

Mr. HAWKES. I wonder whether there would be any real objection to including in the amendment the words I have suggested, and thus showing clearly what we have in mind. The addition, in my opinion, would be most worth while.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I myself have no objection to it, but I would wish to confer with other Senators before agreeing to include it.

Mr. HAWKES. I earnestly suggest that the Senator seriously consider its inclusion, because I believe it would improve the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator for the suggestion.

Mr. President, returning to the point that the Selective Training and Service Act was amended in October 1942, so as to make it apply to 18-year-old and 19-year-old boys, I wish to point out the position which was taken by the military leaders at that time. Of course, the military leaders will oppose the pending amendment. They wish to have complete power and domination in every respect over every person in the country in time of war. I shall not attempt and I would not attempt to dim the words of praise which have been spoken of the leaders of our military and naval forces. No one could do that. But I wish to say that is no reason why any Member of the Congress should evade his duty to look after the welfare of the people of this country in time of war as well as in time of peace. If such boys are to be called into service under laws made by this body, certainly this body should see to it that they receive proper training.

I say again that we are the only country of which I know that has not legislated upon this subject. I think the time has come, under the facts of the case relative to the sending of American troops into battle, for us to legislate.

In 1942, when the Selective Training and Service Act was amended to cover the 18-year-old and 19-year-old boys, I am sure the people of our country believed that such boys would receive a year's training. If Senators will study the RECORD of those days they will find that, judging from the remarks made by Senators at that time, many Senators believed that such inductees would receive a year's training.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator read the debate which took place on the subject?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator gained the impression from the debate that the program of inducting 18-year-olds was not for the purpose of affording them the opportunity of 1 year's training.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that that definitely was the thought of many Senators who voted on the matter in 1942.

Mr. KILGORE. How does the Senator interpret the record which was interpreted by some as meaning that that was the purpose of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should be glad to have the views of my colleague who was then in the Senate on that subject. I should like to know his views as to what was intended?

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to have the view of my colleague, and his impression gained from reading the debate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. From reading the debate I am impressed with the belief that it was the intention of those who voted for the bill that by calling up 18 and 19-year-old boys a year's training would result. The Senators who voted for the bill had reason to believe in that way. In fairness to General Marshall, who testified, I wish to say that at no time did he say that individuals must be given a year's training. However, he did say it required a year of training to

prepare a division. He stated that the Germans trained their divisions for 2 years before putting them into combat.

I also read the following language from the statement of General Marshall. It is from the RECORD of October 22, 1942:

But it should be perfectly clear in your mind that what we turn out in January 1943 is not available until January 1944, and the men whom it is proposed to induct under this estimate in December 1943 will not be available in newly trained units until January 1945.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator if he would not naturally draw the conclusion from the statement which he has read that 1 year's training would be provided.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Certainly, I would draw that conclusion; and the people of this country had the right to believe from that language that there would be a year of training.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that I believe there has been a definite violation of that understanding. I believe there has been a gross departure from the Army's own policy as announced by the Acting Chief of Staff when he said, that no boy under 19 years of age was being sent into combat as an Infantry replacement. I also believe there has been a departure from the policy as announced in the statement contained in the release of the War Department on December 8, 1944, in which it was stated that 8 months of training were required from the time a boy was inducted until he was placed in combat.

I have received numerous letters on this subject. I shall not attempt to read all of them. For the benefit of the Senate I wish to invite attention to some of the cases, tragic as they are, which absolutely impress me with the necessity of action by this Government. Can we not see the position in which the American 18-year-old boy is placed unless we act? Here are our allies, exercising definite limitations as to when their young men may leave their country. We are not doing that. We say, "Give them the training before putting them into combat, wherever they may be." However, our allied countries have said that their boys may not leave England, for example, until they are 18½ years old; that they shall not leave Canada until they are 19 years old; that they shall not leave Australia until they are 19 years old; and that they shall not leave New Zealand until they are 21 years old. In what position does that leave the American boy? When troops are needed and our allies are asked to supply men, the answer is that the men are not available. Why are they not available? Because of the legislation enacted in those countries for the protection of their boys. The result is that we are calling out American boys to fill in the gap. Do Senators wonder that Mr. Churchill rose on the floor of the House of Commons in the early part of January and said that the losses on the western front were from 60 to 70 Americans to 1 British?

Mr. President, we owe the great duty to our military leaders of backing them

up, and we have backed them up. We have been confronted with the duty of doing our part in the prosecution of this war, and we have done so. But we also owe the duty to every American boy who is called into service of insuring that he shall not be made the victim of a legislative situation which we create by failing to enact a proper law.

I invite attention to a letter which was addressed to the Baltimore Sun. It reads in part as follows:

I have a son who, after only 12 weeks of training at a southern camp and a 5-day furlough at the end, was shipped overseas. My son will reach his 19th birthday June 6, 1945. We have already received that much-dreaded telegram from the Secretary of War expressing his deep regret that our son was wounded in France, March 21, 1945.

There was a case involving 12 weeks of training.

The other day during the course of the debate I heard it said that a man who had received a year's training could be wounded as well as a man who received less training. Of course that is true. But I assert that the man who has been trained can better fight, and better take care, not only of himself but his comrades around him, than can the man who has not received adequate training. Of course, I realize that no assurance can be given against his being wounded or killed, regardless of how much training he has received. But when we take green, untrained boys, some of whom are undeveloped, and place them in the armed forces they certainly, and in all reason, are less fitted to protect themselves and those around them than they would be after receiving adequate training. I submit that 6 months of training is a minimum of adequate training in such a war as this, involving the use of unusual weapons.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter from Brooklyn, N. Y. It was not written by the mother of a boy in the service. It was written by a lady who apparently was finely interested in American boys. She speaks of two boys in her church who were killed before they were 18½ years old. That was not 8 months from the time of induction until they had been placed in combat. I read from that letter:

Two of these immature boys who attended my church were killed before they were 18½ years old. Just think of it—18½ years old.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the letter from which the Senator has just read state that those boys had been inducted?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The letter does not state that they had been inducted.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, those boys may have been volunteers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is hardly possible; it is not mentioned in the letter. I do not believe that there were any volunteers in the Army in 1944. I do not believe—in fact, I know that a boy cannot enter the service until he is 18 years of age, whether he enters as the result of being drafted by his board, or volunteers through the board. So they must have been 18 when they went into the Army.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is an assumption upon the part of the Senator. There have been many 18-year-old boys, and even younger ones, who volunteered in this war and were killed. Boys are still volunteering in the Navy service, as I understand.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator know of any boys 18 years old who volunteered in the Army?

Mr. LUCAS. They are inducted after they are 18, but I raise the point in connection with the letter the Senator has read whether or not the boys might not have been volunteers, and then the question arises as to how much training they had. The letter does not say anything about the training the boys had.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; the letter does not say anything about the training, but if a boy cannot enter the Army until he is 18 and he is killed before he is 18½, we can pretty well know that he did not have 6 months' training.

I have here a letter from Iowa which states that a boy who received 12 weeks' training was killed when he was 18 years of age. I desire to read the letter:

I'm glad for the stand you take in defense of the 18-year-old boys. It is too late to save my son. He was 18 last August. After only 12 weeks' training in the Infantry he was sent across the last of January, landing February 2, and was killed in the front lines in Germany on March 5.

I have before me the case of an 18-year-old California boy who received 14 weeks' training and was then sent into combat and killed.

Here is a case from the State of Illinois of another 18-year-old boy who had 14 weeks' training in the Infantry and then was sent into combat.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is it that England and Canada and New Zealand and Australia prohibit their boys from going into combat duty until, in some instances, they are as old as 21?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the case in New Zealand.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the reason for it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The reason for it is that the legislative bodies of those countries and their governments feel that boys of such tender years are rather immature and ought to be trained. I assign that as the reason, and certainly that is the best reason that could be advanced. They feel that they owe to their own people some consideration; they feel that they owe to the boys whom they have called up for battle duty the consideration of keeping them at home until they are properly trained and sufficiently mature to go out and fight and be able to protect themselves and others around them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield further to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why should our boys be asked to do something that the English, the Canadian, the Australian, and the New Zealand boys are not asked to do? What do we have that they do not have?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I feel that we should not ask anything of our boys that the Governments of our Allied countries are not asking of theirs. I think it is a great wrong, and I believe it goes beyond the question of letting the military fight the war, for we owe and we must, even at this late day, give to the boys of this country and to all our people the protection which this Government that represents them should give them.

Returning to some of the cases that have been called to my attention, I have from Indiana the cases of 3 boys 18 years old, members of the same school class, who have been killed. I read from the letter.

In the last month we have lost three 18-year-old boys of our community. Two of those boys stood on our commencement day platform last year. These boys were too young for combat duty.

The writers of that letter were not talking about their own sons; they were talking about other boys of their community.

I do not make an appeal, Mr. President, upon the ground of sentiment—though, if it is sentiment, it is a good one—but I appeal to you upon the ground of fairness to our American boys. I do not want them placed in a position where they are going to be made the victims, or the goats, so to speak, of a legislative situation in the allied countries. Furthermore I make the appeal not only for the green trooper, but I make it for the trained man with whom the 18-year-old youth is sent into combat, and who assumes another risk when he attempts to look out for and protect the new boy.

The statement has been made that 8 months elapse between the time of his induction and the time he enters battle. I have here the case from Ashtabula, Ohio, of an 18-year-old boy who was killed 5 months after his induction. There was no 8 months' period there.

With all respect to the great military leaders of our country, I say to you, Mr. President, that the time has come when the people, and particularly the boys who are inducted, have a right to look to their Government to protect them equally with those alongside whom they fight. Of course, in time of war the military leaders will conduct the war; we look to them and we lean upon them to do it; but the time has not come when we should turn over the civil policies of the Government to the military of this country, however much we may respect them. The young men of the country are taken under an edict, a law, of the Congress; and if we have the duty to call them into service, we also have the duty to say that they shall receive adequate training when they are called.

There was circulated around the country some weeks ago a picture which appeared apparently in many newspapers throughout the United States, because the same picture was cut out and sent to me from various cities and towns. I

have it here. It is a picture of two German boys. The title is "Teen-Age Nazis," and then it is stated:

These two boys, 17 (left) and 18, were part of the troops thrown up against Field Marshal Montgomery's men after they spanned the Rhine. Both boys went into combat with less than 12 weeks of preliminary training.

Mr. President, that was given to the American public and given to us to shock us, to hold up before us the situation of the enemy, to shock us into knowing how little training the enemy were giving to their teen-age boys.

We have been guilty of the same offense. Those German boys were fighting on their native soil; they were called up to fight with only 12 weeks' training, it is said; and here we have cases of American boys being shipped abroad to fight with 12 weeks' training, some being killed before they are 18½ years of age.

I submit, and I submit in all earnestness, that the time has come when our own people have a right to look to their Government for action in this matter. Six months is certainly a short enough time. Our own General Staff, announcing through the Deputy Chief of Staff only last June, said that the policy of the Army was not to send in an infantry replacement under 19 years of age, and the policy of the Army was not to send into combat in the armored divisions anyone less than 19 years of age. That was the policy of the Army. If it was sound then, it is sound now. If they had that consideration for the young 18-year-old, if they felt that he was not a good trooper until he was 19, the same course of reasoning applies today, and he is not a seasoned enough soldier to be used now.

Without further argument in this cause, for further argument is not necessary, I say that the time is now at hand for America to act in this serious matter and to put upon our military, into whose hands we place these boys, the duty of training them for a fixed period. Never yet has there been any reason, I care not what the situation may have been, for sending green, untrained troops of America into battle.

I know the zeal with which military men lead. They are there to fight. I have heard generals speak of soldiers as "bodies," saying, "We want so many bodies." I do not like that reference. Perhaps they have to be hardened, but you and I, Mr. President, owe the definite obligation to these boys to see that they do receive adequate training. And even the military themselves said they were not putting them into the infantry and the armored divisions until they were 19 years of age, but they are, we find, now violating that policy. I say that if they once adopted that policy as a good one, it is just as good now. Certainly we are not going too far when we ask for a minimum training of 6 months.

We still have a representative government in America; we still have our great Republic; our people still speak through their selected representatives, in war as well as in time of peace, and when the time comes for us to act upon a subject of this kind, the representatives of the people will do it with courage, without hysteria, with soundness. Again I say,

Mr. President, that the time is here, on this day, when Congress must act if we are to perform our duty toward the American boys we have called up for the highest and most dangerous service that can be placed on any citizen.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hart	Murdock
Austin	Hatch	Murray
Bailey	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Buck	Hill	Radcliffe
Burton	Hoey	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	La Follette	Shipstead
Chandler	Lucas	Smith
Chavez	McCarran	Stewart
Donnell	McClellan	Taft
Downey	McFarland	Taylor
Eastland	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tydings
Fulbright	Maybank	Walsh
Gerry	Millikin	White
Green	Mitchell	Wiley
Gurney	Morse	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I examine the amendment now pending, which has been modified by the Walsh amendment, it seems that men 18 years of age who are drafted into the Army would have to have the 6 months' training, but that men who volunteer to go into the Marine Corps or those who are in the Navy or in the Coast Guard or the reserve components thereof, would not have to have 6 months' training.

The amendment makes discrimination as between the marines on the one hand and the Army on the other. The discrimination is between men who are 18 years of age and those who are 17 years of age, because the amendment would apply only to 18-year-olds in the Army, whereas we know there are many men who enlist in the Navy and in the Marine Corps who are 17 years of age, and the amendment would not apply to them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. As I interpret the amendment, as to those who are drafted into the Marine Corps or into the Coast Guard—if there are any drafted into the Coast Guard—the Navy will be obliged to prevent them from being sent into ordinary combat for 6 months. In other words, the Marine Corps draftees and the Coast Guard draftees will be treated the same as the Army men who are under 18 years of age. The amendment proposed by me would permit the Navy to put enlisted men in the Navy personnel or in the Coast Guard on vessels, to be trained on vessels, though they have not been in the service 6 months. If the amendment is agreed to, I do not think there would be any distinction between

the draftees in the Marine Corps and in the Coast Guard and the draftees in the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, and it is certainly my information, practically all the men who go into the Marines are volunteers. Today the Navy is obtaining half its new increment of personnel by volunteering. As we know, many if not most of the men who are volunteering are 17 years of age.

Mr. President, to show the inconsistency of this kind of legislation, that is, of Congress trying to do a thing of this kind, by the amendment we would say that a man who is 18 years of age must have at least 6 months' training, whereas for the man who is 17 years of age we prescribe no training whatever.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, the Senator's argument is made against the original amendment which would apply to both the Army and the Navy. Those who volunteer into the Army are not subject to the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Of course the Senator knows that the Army is not now taking men who volunteer. All the men who now come into the Army come in through the Selective Service. I think the Marines are getting practically all their men by voluntary enlistment. I think the Coast Guard has gotten most of its men, if not all of them, by enlistment. The Navy, according to the figures which I have, which I am sure are correct, is getting about half its men by enlistment. Remember that most of these men who are coming in by enlistment are under 18. They are 17-year-old boys.

If we adopt the amendment we shall be in the position of saying that we want to throw this protection around the 18-year-old to be sure that he receives 6 months' training, but so far as the 17-year-old is concerned we do nothing about him at all.

Mr. WALSH. I think the argument of the Senator is correct. The purpose of the modification suggested by me is to prevent the amendment being so interpreted that the Navy would be precluded from training its men on vessels. The amendment is applicable to the Navy. Of course, the Navy would be even better protected from this amendment if the words "or Navy" in the first clause of the amendment as originally presented were stricken out.

Mr. HILL. In other words, what the Senator is seeking to do is to take the Navy out from under this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. No.

Mr. HILL. To a very large extent that is the purpose.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. HILL. That is the purpose of the modification suggested by the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. It is to prevent the Navy from being denied the right to place upon a vessel for training a boy who has enlisted or volunteered. The amendment would not exempt the marines or Seabees, because they do the same kind of work the Army does. They would not come under this amendment. Only those who are training on ships would be excepted.

Mr. HILL. The Senator realizes, of course, that under the terms of the amendment, all marines and all Seabees who have entered the service as volunteers would not come under the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. In my opinion they would.

Mr. HILL. I invite the Senator's attention to the language of the amendment, which very clearly shows that they would not come under the terms of the amendment. It must be remembered that this whole bill is an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act. That is the act which Congress enacted to draft men into the armed forces. I invite the Senator's attention to the language of the amendment:

And provided further, That no man under 19 years of age who is inducted into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act—

That means the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. HILL. The act continues:

shall be ordered into actual combat service until after he has been given at least 6 months of military training—

Of course, under that language, any man who volunteers to go into the Marines, the Navy, the Seabees, or the Coast Guard would not come under the inhibition which the amendment prescribes.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. HILL. Because he would not come under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. So we have the very discrimination to which I am calling attention. The only men who would be affected by the amendment would be men 18 years of age who were drafted into the Army. Men who volunteered for the Navy, the Seabees, the Marines, or the Coast Guard, many thousands of them being 17 years of age, would not come under the terms of the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. That is my understanding.

Mr. HILL. So we find a discrimination between boys 17 years old and those 18 years old.

Mr. WALSH. All that would be accomplished by the modification which I have suggested would be that the Navy would be permitted to train, on vessels, those under the age limit specified in the amendment who entered the service of the Navy. If they should happen to be on a vessel which became engaged in combat, the Navy could not be charged with ordering them into combat.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator says is the heart of the whole thing. I understand that the Senator construes the language to mean drafted men as well as those who voluntarily enlist. Am I correct in that interpretation?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. The modification suggested by the Senator would take the Navy and the Coast Guard out from under the amendment. I believe that would be its practical effect. So far as the marines are concerned, inasmuch as the personnel of the marines has been built

up by voluntary enlistment, the marines would not be affected either. So what do we find? When we carefully examine the amendment, we find that it applies only to boys in the Army who are 18 years old. Because of the language of the amendment, and because of the modification suggested by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Seabees, and the Marines, to all intents and purposes, would be taken out from under the amendment; and we find discrimination between the Army on the one hand, and the Navy, the Seabees, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard on the other hand.

We find a further discrimination, in that the amendment would apply only to those who are 18 years old, whereas there would be no application to those who are younger than 18.

Mr. WALSH. In my opinion, the amendment would apply to draftees who are inducted into the Marine Corps and Coast Guard, within these age limits, and who are not trained on vessels. Such men are not trained on vessels. Personally, I feel that a marine, who is trained for land combat, as a soldier is trained, and a Seabee, who is trained as a soldier is trained, should be treated in the same way as Army draftees are treated. To repeat, the purpose of my amendment is to assure the Navy the right to place upon vessels enlisted men who are to be trained for sea duty.

Mr. HILL. I suppose the Senator is correct. A Coast Guard man who is not to be used on a vessel would not be trained on a vessel. He would not, therefore, go into combat as a Coast Guard man. I do not know how a Coast Guard man would go into combat, except on a vessel of some kind. He might be stationed at some land base, and there might be an attack by enemy airplanes, and he might be called upon to man an anti-aircraft gun. However, the practical effect of the amendment is to take the Navy, the Marines, the Coast Guard, and the Seabees out from under the inhibitions of the amendment, because they are made up of men who voluntarily enlist.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has made the argument that this provision should apply to enlistees, and particularly to those who enlist in the Navy at 17 years of age.

Mr. HILL. The Senator must not put words in my mouth, because that thought is not in my mind. I am not making that appeal, because I am against the whole theory of the amendment. I am calling attention to the discrimination which would exist under the terms of the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the amendment were changed so as to apply to all persons, whether inducted at the command of the Government, or whether they enlist with the consent of their parents, would the Senator support the amendment?

Mr. HILL. I certainly would not support the amendment, because I am opposed to the whole proposition embodied in the amendment. I am opposed to the

Congress at this time trying to write into the law any kind of inhibition such as that embodied in the amendment. I believe that we should continue to allow General Marshall and the officials of the War Department to operate the Army, as they have been operating it in the past.

Mr. REVERCOMB. With respect to the 17-year-old enlistees, the Senator realizes that they cannot enlist unless they have the consent of their parents, who, better than anyone else, know as to their maturity and know the kind of boys they are permitting to enter the service. They know better than anyone else whether or not they can fit into the training which is being offered.

Furthermore, with respect to the Marines, I quote from a letter which the able Senator from Alabama placed in the RECORD on April 23, 1945. The letter was written by Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

As to the Marine Corps, it is the present practice, even under the extreme combat pressure and high casualties encountered, to afford recruits 5 months' training in the United States and further training in a combat unit on the advanced fronts which is in preparation for future operations.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly right.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As a practical matter, no wrong is done the marines.

Mr. HILL. So far as the marines are concerned, the Secretary says that they are given 5 months' training in the United States. The Senator's amendment would make it mandatory that they shall not go into combat until they have had at least 6 months of training. However, I do not think the amendment would apply to the marines. The marines are largely made up of personnel who volunteered, rather than of those who were drafted under the Selective Training and Service Act. Under the language of the amendment as it now stands, with the Walsh proviso, I think the Navy, the Marines, the Coast Guard, and the Seabees, according to my way of thinking, are fairly well taken care of. For all practical purposes, I think they are outside the scope of the amendment. I wish to congratulate my distinguished friend the Senator from Massachusetts, who always is so able and so diligent in behalf of the Navy. Today we have the mightiest Navy the mind of man ever dreamed of, and there has been no greater friend and no greater builder of our Navy than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I congratulate him. On this very bill I think he has rendered the Navy a great service.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator's gracious compliment is sincerely appreciated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I join in the statement made about the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

With respect to the statement of the Senator from Alabama that the amendment would prevent such inductees from being placed in units abroad, I wish to say there is nothing in the amendment which states where they shall be trained.

The only prohibition is that they shall not be sent into combat until they have had 6 months' training.

Further, let me say that I do not agree with the interpretation placed upon the amendment by my able friend, namely, that it does not apply to the Marine Corps or to the Navy or to the Coast Guard. It simply says, in substance, under the modification offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, as I understand it, that boys in the Navy may continue to be trained aboard ship. That is all it says.

Mr. HILL. But the Senator will admit, will he not, that it would not apply to a marine who voluntarily entered the service?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; as to a volunteer, that is correct at the present time.

Mr. HILL. And does not the Senator know that today practically all those in the Marine Corps have entered that service by way of voluntary enlistment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not all the personnel.

Mr. HILL. Practically all of them have.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should like to ask a question of the Presiding Officer or the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama. Has the word "combat" been accepted as a part of the Walsh amendment or modification on page 2, in line 4?

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the authors of the amendment accepted that word and modified their amendment to include it, as they had a right to do. As the Senator knows, when an amendment is offered on the floor, until the yeas and nays have been ordered on it the authors of the amendment have a right to modify it in any way they may see fit. It is my understanding that the amendment has been modified by its authors to include the word "combat." In fact, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], one of the authors of the amendment, so stated on the floor of the Senate earlier in the day.

Mr. MURDOCK. So we now have a prohibition against placing any Navy enlisted man on a combat vessel until after he has had 6 months' training.

Mr. HILL. No, no. The very purpose of the proviso was to do the opposite. The very purpose of the proviso was to do the exact contrary, namely, to permit the Navy men, whether they were inducted or whether they voluntarily enlisted, to go on a combat vessel before they had had 6 months' training. That was the purpose of the proviso.

Mr. MURDOCK. But now we have just the reverse of that, if the amendment is adopted, namely, that they cannot go on a combat vessel.

Mr. HILL. No. If the amendment is adopted, they can go on a combat vessel. That is what I was calling attention to. In other words today the amendment is so very discriminatory. What it has done, for all practical purposes, is to take the Navy, practically all the Coast Guard, and the Marines and the Seabees out from under its provisions, leav-

ing within its scope only those in the Army, the land forces.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The amendment has been changed so often and so rapidly that I have not been able to keep up with it. The Senator now takes the position that regardless of the fact that an enlisted man in the Navy has not received 6 months' training, he can nevertheless be assigned to duty on a combat vessel.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The Senator will observe the following language on page 2:

This proviso shall not be construed—

And the proviso referred to is that appearing on page 1 of the amendment—

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand.

Mr. HILL. At that point we find the following language:

This proviso shall not be construed as preventing the assignment of enlisted men of the Navy or Coast Guard and the reserve components thereof to duty for training on combat vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard and at naval bases beyond the continental limits of the United States.

The whole purpose of the amendment and the very reason why I congratulated the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, so warmly and so heartily was that I feel he has taken the Navy out from under the operation of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I should like to say a further word, and then I shall be delighted to yield to my friend the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, this is exactly what the authors of the amendment have done when they modified their amendment to include the Walsh amendment: The modified amendment now provides that when a man in the Navy completes his boot training—training of 15 weeks or 17 weeks, or whatever it may be—he then can be placed on a combat vessel, where his training can be continued. That is what we have done with respect to the Navy. But the amendment, if it is adopted as it now reads, would have us say, "When the Navy men have finished their boot training, we will let them get their team training on a combat vessel, where they will have to fight and play their part. But the men in the Army, who get their basic training in 15 to 17 weeks, cannot join a combat division, they cannot go into a corresponding combat unit of the Army, but they must wait. They will be held back. If they finish their basic training in 15 or 17 weeks, they must wait until 6 months have expired, before we will permit them to go on a team and get team training and be where they can learn to play their part."

That is all the pending amendment means, and that shows the fallacy of the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. I previously promised to yield to the Senator from South Carolina, so I shall yield to him at this time, if the Senator from Utah will please wait.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the able junior Senator from Alabama has well spoken of the punitive feature of the amendment, if I may so term it, in other words, the part of the amendment which would penalize the Army. The other branches of our armed forces would be exempted. It has been my belief for some time that the Army has been penalized in other ways. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama if it is not a fact that young men of 17 are permitted, if they so desire, to enlist in the Navy, the Marines, or the Coast Guard, but they are prohibited from enlisting in the Army.

Mr. HILL. That is correct; today they cannot enlist in the Army. The Army is taking no voluntary enlistments.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amendment would also fail to prevent service on combat vessels by young men of 17 who voluntarily enlisted in the Navy, the Marines, or the Coast Guard. They could be assigned to combat vessels for further training after they had completed their boot training; if they volunteered for service in such units when they were 17 years of age, they likewise could go on such combat ships.

Mr. HILL. Of course. They go right on the combat vessels.

Mr. MAYBANK. That situation serves to bring to the attention of the Committee on Military Affairs the fact that one of the most serious troubles the Army has had in providing sufficient training for the 18-year-old boys and one of the serious situations with which the Army has been faced is that so many boys 17 years of age, who would have joined the Army when they became 18 years of age, have volunteered to join the Navy or the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, and thus they were not available to the Army. The average man in the Army is definitely older than the average man in the Navy, the Marines, or the Coast Guard. The great difficulty for those administering the Army during the war has been to obtain young men, because of the advantage the Navy, the Marines, and the Coast Guard have had by way of voluntary enlistments.

The pending amendment, if adopted, would further penalize the Army. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. The Army is not accepting voluntary enlistments and is not inducting any men under 18 years of age. The Navy has obtained all the men it needs. As we all know, thousands of men have entered the Navy. We have now reached the situation where we are asked to allow the Navy to carry out its

program of training but to deny the Army a similar right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In order to keep the record straight, let us note here that men under 18 years of age may enlist in the Army. That fact is contrary to the statements which have been made here.

Mr. HILL. It has been my understanding that the Army has not been accepting any voluntary enlistments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is no law denying the Army the privilege of taking volunteers. If they are not taking them, the choice is theirs. Volunteers are actually accepted in the Air Corps.

Mr. HILL. If voluntary enlistments are being allowed in the Air Corps—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I know the lobby in the galleries is nodding to the contrary, but they are mistaken.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the Air Corps are not accepting any men for voluntary service.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Some volunteers at the age of 17 have been accepted by the Air Corps for the purpose of enabling them to go to college. I was told by the Military Affairs Committee this morning that volunteers were not being taken. But I know that some men of 17 years of age are enlisting in the Air Corps so that they may go to school. However, in this debate we are discussing combat fighting.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Carolina is correct. No volunteers are being taken for combat service. Some volunteers are being accepted for the purpose of enabling them to go to college for a year, or whatever the time may be.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was told some time ago that the training was of a pre-flight nature.

Mr. HILL. So far as any voluntary enlistments are concerned, we know that we now have a backlog of air cadets approximately 6,500 in number. However, at the present time voluntary enlistments are not being accepted even for that branch of the service.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in complimenting the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in the very efficient manner in which he has taken care of the Navy of the United States. He has done an excellent job.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I merely wish to read into the Record the statement which was made by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] yesterday. He said:

It seems to me that naval training is a very different thing from Army training.

He suggested inserting the word "combat" before the word "vessel", and stated:

I merely wanted to suggest that men could be placed on combat vessels for training, and clearly if they are combat vessels then the men go on combat vessels, that is all.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I can see no difference between assigning a man in the Navy for training on a combat vessel and assigning a man in the Army for training with a division. The division is to the Army exactly what the combat vessel is to the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am surprised to hear the Senator make a comparison of that kind, because there is no ground for it. There is no basis for the comparison which he has made in saying that the division is to the Army what the naval vessel is to the Navy. I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] succeeded in having his amendment agreed to. I think it was a good amendment. The Navy does not have sufficient training vessels to train its men, and many of them must be trained on combat vessels. For that reason I am glad that the amendment as clarified was accepted. But when the implication is made that someone is obtaining a great advantage, that someone has sneaked something in here as against someone else, and that a discrimination has taken place, I wish to voice my opposition to any such implication, any such argument, or any such lack of logic.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator should resort to the use of the word "sneaked," and state that something has been sneaked in here. Nobody has sneaked anything in here. Certainly there was no intention to imply that anybody had sneaked anything in. I congratulated the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for what I thought was very fine work which he had done. Everything that was done was done in the open. It was done before the Senate and with the full knowledge of the Senate. However, I assert that a division of the Army is the combat unit of the Army in the same way that a combat ship is the combat unit of the Navy. The Navy fights with combat ships. The Army fights with combat divisions. That is the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts was not only agreed to openly and with the approval of the Senate but it was also acceptable to the sponsors of the amendment. It was accepted by them.

Mr. HILL. It was accepted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There was nothing secret about it; it was done openly. I do not see why we should be called upon to congratulate any Member of the Senate for pulling off a smart stunt of that kind because there was no stunt about it. It was simply a necessary protection that should have been afforded. It was afforded, and all of us are very happy about it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I did not in any way mean to imply, either directly or indirectly, that any stunt had been pulled off here. Certainly the furthest thing from my mind was that anything had been sneaked in here. I do not like to hear the Senator speak in that way, because it detracts from the credit which I think the Senator from Massachusetts deserves. He came here in open and honorable combat, and he won the day. He came here to do a job, and he did it with the approbation of the Senate. He was so persuasive that he received the approbation of the authors of this amendment. He did his work well, and everything he did was done in the finest and most commendatory manner. Why the Senator from Colorado should try to inject the idea that the Senator from Massachusetts did anything other than that which was done in the very finest and best kind of a way I cannot understand. I repeat, I cannot understand it. I realize it may be rather painful to the Senator from Colorado when he considers the discrimination which will exist between the Army and the Navy under this amendment if it is adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is not a matter of discrimination; it is a matter of recognizing entirely different conditions and adapting legislation to fit the different conditions; it is a proper legislative adjustment. Simply because the Navy must be permitted to do certain things is no reason that the Army should be permitted to do them. The two are not on such a comparable basis that what is right for one must essentially be right for the other.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator from Colorado and I do not agree. If we agreed, then I might hope to attain at least some modicum of the success which my distinguished friend the Senator from Massachusetts has attained. It is my firm conviction, Mr. President, that it is just as necessary for a man in the Army after he completes his 15 or 17 weeks of boot training to get his further training with a division as it is for a man in the Navy after he has completed his 15 or 17 weeks' boot training to finish his training on a combat vessel. When the Navy man is permitted to finish his training on a combat vessel, while the Army man is not permitted to finish his training with a division, then I say there is gross discrimination in the manner of handling the Army and the Navy; the Army is discriminated against and you seek to interfere and impose your will and your edict on the Army, while you refuse to do that so far as the Navy is concerned.

Mr. President, yesterday I occupied the floor for some 2 or 3 hours. I have no disposition to go back over a twice-told tale or to delay a vote, but I feel that I ought to call the attention of the Senate again to one or two statements which General Marshall made in his letter of April 17 to

the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I read this letter in full yesterday. I shall not read it in full at this time, but I do want to call attention to one or two statements made by General Marshall. All of us know General Marshall; every Member of the Senate, I think, without exception, has had some direct personal contact with General Marshall. We have heard him talk; we have seen him at different times when committees of the Senate met with him, when he discussed the war and its different phases. I think we must all agree that General Marshall is a man who is careful of speech, who weighs his words, who is always cautious, who does not exaggerate, who seeks to be sure to give the exact picture, and to speak the absolute truth. General Marshall says:

I am gravely concerned over the effect of either of these proposals upon military operations.

I say, Senators, that that is about as strong language as General Marshall could have used; I do not think he could have used stronger language than to have said he was "gravely concerned" as to the effect of the pending amendments.

Such statutory restrictions—

He says—

are evidently inspired by the belief that our soldiers are not properly trained before being assigned to combat units. The responsible military authorities, however, are of the opinion that the training is adequate to the requirements.

The training program is very intensive and equally thorough.

Then he goes on to say:

I have personally inspected many replacement training camps to make certain that the work is being conducted in the most efficient manner practicable. General Lear, and now General Stilwell, give their entire time to the direction and supervision of this work, Lear in Europe and Stilwell here at home.

Then General Marshall says:

The War Department has made every possible effort consonant with the military situation to hold to a minimum the number of 18-year-olds entering combat.

And General Marshall gives us this promise as to the future:

Just as soon as the military situation will permit, it is the purpose of the War Department to stop shipping men overseas who have not yet become 19 years of age, and I am hopeful that this condition will develop in the near future.

Mr. President, having read those extracts from the letter of General Marshall to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I should like at this point to read two extracts from a letter which General Marshall wrote to Representatives Hess, of Ohio, less than a month ago, in which General Marshall said:

For the past 6 months we have been combating the coastal defense commands and our bases in Alaska and the Caribbean for men who are suitable for infantry replacements, they themselves to be replaced by personnel of such physical limitations that they could not be employed in combat service. The same procedure is being followed through all the rear areas in the overseas theaters,

yet we are still short in replacements and under the heaviest pressure from our field commanders to obtain them.

Then General Marshall wrote these significant words:

The choice in the matter—

The decision he had to make in the matter—

The choice in the matter is very clear; either we must accept delays in operations in Europe and in the Pacific, or we must follow the present procedure. There is no other course. To delay the operations now under way would, in my opinion, be a tragic error.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there a Senator on the floor who would vote for an amendment if he thought it would delay the successful ending of the war? That is exactly what General Marshall is concerned about in his statement which the Senator has read.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am delighted the Senator asked the question. I had in mind asking it myself, after I had concluded reading the statement from General Marshall. I am glad the Senator has anticipated me. The letter continues:

To delay the operations now under way would, in my opinion, be a tragic error resulting in an inevitably increased loss in life by the prolongation of the war. I am quite certain that the people of the United States would not make this choice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask another question, a question to parallel the one propounded by the Senator from Illinois. Is there any Senator who believes that the adoption of the pending amendment would in any way delay or embarrass anyone in connection with the conduct of the war?

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HILL. Let me answer the question first. I will say to the Senator, in reply to his question, what I said to the Senator from Illinois a few minutes before I took the floor to speak, that I have grave apprehensions that this amendment would slow down and retard the momentum of our forces in Germany, would prolong the war, and cost additional American lives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I find it difficult to take the arguments of the Senator seriously.

Mr. HILL. I am sorry that in a matter such as this, which, in my opinion, involves the lives of our fighting boys at the front and the question whether we will win the war in the shortest possible time and save every life we can, the Senator from Colorado is unable to be serious about what I say.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. It is merely a question whether we are going to believe General Marshall in a statement that is crystal clear upon this question, or are going to follow the advice and counsel of men here on the Senate floor. If there was ever a plainer statement as to what the amendment would do, then I do not understand the English language. I am relying upon Gen. George Marshall rather than upon arguments made on the floor of the Senate with respect to what the effect of the amendment would be on the prolongation of the war.

Certainly, with the record George Marshall has made in the war in behalf of America and in behalf of the saving of American lives, with the record of the strategy that has been used in the Pacific and elsewhere in the saving of American lives, and with the record of the victories we have had under Marshall, and King, and other leaders in the war, the most magnificent in all history, are we here in the Senate to set ourselves up as military strategists on a very important question at a very crucial hour? That is what I am saying, and that is all. I cannot understand why the Senate does not give to Marshall the confidence he deserves in this crisis, at this particular time. If his is not a clear-cut statement that American lives will be lost and the war will be prolonged if the amendment shall be adopted, then, I repeat, I do not understand the English language.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator has stated the matter so clearly and so forcefully that there is nothing I can add. Who but George Marshall has had the supreme responsibility for mobilizing our Army, for training our Army, for sending our Army overseas, for the deployment of our Army overseas, and for fighting the war? Who more than any other man has contributed to the incomparable, the almost unbelievable, victories of our Army, but George Marshall? Who is there we can set above George Marshall to tell us what to do as to the operation and the fighting of our Army?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make the further observation that if our Army and Navy had been unsuccessful, if we had had one military and one naval reverse after another, then I would not have the confidence which I have in our top leaders, and I could, of course, seriously consider any amendment of this kind; but, Mr. President, I cannot understand, when the great victories throughout the world are before our minds, how the Senate of the United States at a crucial time, so far as the war in Europe is concerned, can take the position it is asked to take. It does not seem right to me. Of course, I am only one Senator, and have only my own opinion about the matter, but I cannot understand it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The only thought I had in addition to the most excellent

statements made by the Senator from Illinois was that apparently the pending amendment in its present shape is aimed at the War Department and General Marshall, that it is a discriminatory amendment, since it excepts the Marine Corps and the Navy.

Returning to the question the Senator from Alabama and I discussed with the Senator from Colorado, I stepped from the Chamber for a moment and telephoned the Department, and what the Senator from Alabama and I said has been confirmed, that no one is allowed to volunteer in the Army until he is 18, that the few cadets of the Air Corps who volunteer at 17 years of age are not even allowed to go into the Army until they become 18 years old.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say, except that this is the most discriminatory amendment aimed at the Army I have ever seen, since the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps are exempted from its operations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to make a short statement, if the Senator will be kind enough to permit me to do so.

So far as the pending amendment is concerned, and so far as it affects the military operations of this country at the present time, it is entirely academic. There is nothing crucial about it. I am certain that whatever discussions were had with General Marshall, and whatever quotations have been made from his statements, they have not been concerned with the pending amendment. I am certain, too, the amendment is not aimed at the War Department. I have just as much confidence in General Marshall as has any other Senator on this floor, and I think he has the confidence of the Senate and of the country to a degree never exceeded by any general in any of our wars at any time in our history. Certainly he has my confidence.

All men have weaknesses, and I dare say General Marshall has his weaknesses. I do not know what they are, unless he has the weakness of being too sensitive, too much afraid that people are not supporting him if they differ with him in minor matters.

Mr. President, this amendment was not offered by its sponsors in order to cast aspersions at the Army or to criticize General Marshall or to find any fault with the conduct of the war. It was to reassure the mothers of America that their boys 18 years of age were going to have 6 months of training.

I am surprised that there is a Senator on this floor who disagrees that a boy 18 years old should have 6 months of military and combat training. That is the issue. Are Senators opposed to 18-year-old boys having 6 months of training? I cannot believe they are, and I cannot believe that General Marshall is. I am sure that he is in favor of much more training than that. I am sure he wants to give them more than 6 months' training; I am sure he is going to give them more than 6 months' training; and I am sure that if this amendment shall be agreed to it will have

no effect whatsoever on the military operations of the United States in this war. The amendment casts absolutely no reflection upon General Marshall or upon any other military leader of this country.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot agree with the Senator from Colorado when he says this matter is academic. Certainly General Marshall does not think it is academic, for on the day the bill came up in the Senate, and when this amendment was proposed to the Senate, General Marshall wrote a letter to the chairman of the military Affairs Committee, who at that time had charge of the bill on the floor of the Senate, in which the General said that he was gravely concerned over the effect the amendment would have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Was he talking about this amendment?

Mr. HILL. Yes; he was talking about the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He was talking about the substitute that was offered yesterday which was defeated.

Mr. HILL. No; he was talking about both amendments.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to say in all good humor to my friend, the Senator from Alabama, that if the General did say that I do not agree with him, and do not intend to agree with him about it, I wish to recall to the minds of Senators the fact that when we were discussing in the Senate the so-called work-or-fight bill, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff and others tried to make us think that it was absolutely necessary to the success of the present offensive that we pass a law similar to the one passed in Britain about the time of Dunkerque in 1940. I know that what they said about it at that time was not true, because we did not enact the law requested and the results foretold did not occur. The Secretary of War at that time said that if we passed the law, except for its morale effect, it would not be felt otherwise on the front for 6 months.

Mr. President, I do not want the Army to continue to control the men between 18 and 45 in this country when it is no longer necessary that the Army control them. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] the other day said the Army is taking men over 30 years of age, men 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 and over who may have two or three or four children. In my opinion, there is now no excuse for taking such men. Not a single life will be saved by taking them. It may result in starving some children and may affect the lives of some widows and orphans who are left in this country without support, but in my opinion it will not contribute in any way to the success of the Army.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said. The question posed by the illustration I gave the other day has not been answered, and it cannot be successfully answered,

insofar as the effect of the amendment is concerned.

Let us consider this situation: Here is a boy 18 years old ready to be taken, and here is a man 30 years old, who has four children, and who is also ready to be taken. All Senators would say, "Let the boy 18 years old be taken before the man 30 years old, who has four children, is taken." I cited an example the other day of a man 30 years old who had four children, being taken into the Army. I spoke of what I personally know; I was not repeating a rumor; it was not something that someone had written me; I happened to know personally about the case. Yet there is nothing in what is now proposed which says that a man 30 years old should receive the same sort of training it is proposed to give the boy 18 years old.

Military authorities—and I spoke to one military man yesterday who had trained men for the last 3 years—tell me that a boy 18 years old will pick up military training quicker and make a better soldier than such a man as I spoke of, 30 years old, who has left behind him three or four children.

Mr. President, that is the situation which will result from the adoption of the amendment. If it is not a discriminatory amendment from that angle, I know nothing whatever about the situation, and I am now saying nothing concerning the discrimination which is proposed to be made with respect to the Navy. We cannot get away from the argument made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] yesterday with respect to the amendment. If we adopt the amendment, where are the boys of the Navy who have had their 3 months' boot training going to go for the next 3 months until the full 6-month period provided for in the amendment shall have expired? That is a clear-cut situation which arises from the adoption of the amendment. There will be a period of 3 months when the Navy men do nothing because, under the terms of the amendment, they cannot go on a combat ship until 6 months' time has expired. When they have finished their boot training at Great Lakes Naval Training Station or other training stations in this country a period of 3 months remains, if the amendment should become law and that period of 3 months must expire before the Navy men can be placed on a combat ship. That, Mr. President, is another discrimination. In other words, the Navy men are placed in the same category, because we cannot say that a period of 6 months shall apply to one man and 3 months to another. We cannot say that a training period of 6 months shall apply to the 18-year-old boy, and 5 months, or whatever it might be, for the man 30 years old, who has a family. Provision should be made to make the training period over-all if we are to do anything.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois knows that we have all been disturbed about the matter of drafting more farmers from the farm. We are disturbed about taking essential men from key war industries. The more inhibitions we place on the 18-year olds the more it forces us to take men from the

farms or take men from key industries. Think of the discrimination that would result, as the Senator has said. The chances are that men 26, 27, 28, or 29 years old need more training than younger men need to enable them to become good soldiers.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to make a statement with respect to the observation made by the Senator from Illinois, and I think it should be made at this point. The Senator from Illinois, as I understood him, said that men for the Navy would take boot training for a period of 3 months, and then be obliged to loaf around for another 3 months. They would not do that. They would have to take training for a period of 6 months. That is what the law would require them to do if the amendment is adopted. There would be no loafing period at all. The training period would be simply increased from 3 to 6 months.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Tennessee has modified his amendment so as to take care of that situation. Does not the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. STEWART. I think the amendment, without modification, took care of the situation, but the modification made it clearer.

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Tennessee modified his amendment when he accepted the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], so the men may go on combat ships from their boot training.

Mr. STEWART. For training purposes.

Mr. HILL. Of course. But their training continues. A man who entered the Army in 1940 is still training. He may have been in combat with the enemy a dozen times, but he is still training. The Army continues to train him. A football team does not stop training after it has played and won a game, or even after it has played a dozen games.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator forgets that the amendment applies only to boys under 18 years of age. The Senator speaks of men who entered the Army in 1940. In order to have the amendment apply to them they would have to have been 14 years old when they entered the Army in 1940.

Mr. HILL. They all continue to train. So long as a man is in the Army or in the Navy, he continues to train. He begins training when he enters the service and continues to train until the day he leaves the service.

Mr. STEWART. The period of training provided is 6 months.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from Tennessee mean to tell the Senate that after a man has been in the Army or the Navy for 6 months he stops training and does not train any more? Of course, he continues to train until the day he leaves the Army or the Navy.

Mr. STEWART. I understood that the impression the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Alabama were endeavoring to leave with the Senate was that there would not be the full period of 6

months' training. I tried to correct the impression. Perhaps I have muddled the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to say that when I made the statement a moment ago I was laboring under a slight misapprehension, in view of the fact that the Senator from Tennessee has modified his amendment in line with what the Senator from Massachusetts desired. As I now understand the amendment, the Navy men would be exempt from the 6 months' training. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. STEWART. No; the Senator is not correct in his understanding of the situation. Certainly not. I will read the proviso.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would read it.

Mr. STEWART. The proviso is:

This proviso shall not be construed as preventing the assignment of enlisted men of the Navy or Coast Guard and the Reserve components thereof to duty for training—

That word is spelled in the usual way—"t-r-a-i-n-i-n-g."

Mr. LUCAS. I can understand that.

Mr. STEWART. I continue—

on combat vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard and at naval bases beyond the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. After they receive the 3 months' boot training, then they are eligible to go immediately on a combat vessel. Am I correct?

Mr. STEWART. For training purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. For training purposes; but when they get on a combat ship and start from San Francisco or New York any place in the Atlantic or Pacific is a combat area. They are likely to encounter a submarine at any time, and I take it that if they should they would not be able to leave the ship merely because their training period had 3 more months to run.

Mr. STEWART. They would have to do something right away. The law could not be repealed on such short notice.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly why we are discriminating in favor of the Army against the Navy. Everyone knows that 90 percent of the ships on which the boys go after they have finished their preliminary training at Great Lakes or some other naval training station are combat ships, whether they be destroyers, PT boats, or what not. The boys are ready for combat when they board the ships.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; because that is the kind of training that is given the boys in the Navy. They cannot be trained as land forces are trained in the Army. That is the reason why we have made this exception. I did not think it was necessary to make the exception, but the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee insisted on it. I do not see that it would interfere with the operation of the amendment in the least. If it is desired to give naval personnel 3 months' training in boot camp and then 3 months' training aboard a combat vessel, that is perfectly all right. That is what they ought to have.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, yesterday I suggested to the Senate that this amendment was designed to give some hope and prospect of training, and a chance to live, principally for infantry combat soldiers.

Young men 17 years old volunteer for the Navy. The reason they volunteer for the Navy is that when they become 18 years old and subject to the draft, as soon as they are called, if they express a preference for the Navy, the chances are that they will be put immediately into the Infantry. So, in order to beat that, they join the Navy. The Navy is getting the volunteers.

Except for the time a ship is under fire or undergoing a bombing attack, life aboard a Navy ship is not too unpleasant, as my friend the commander will testify. But the most rugged service in the armed forces of the United States, or of any other nation, is that of the infantryman. He is the man who is down in the mud. Foot soldiers must undergo great hardships.

I believe we have now reached the point where the war in Germany, so far as organized resistance is concerned, is almost over. We accomplished that result without the work-or-fight law. We were told that it could not be done, but we did it. I do not want the Army to continue from now on to control the lives of young men, or men between 18 and 45. After the war is over in Germany, which will be within a very short time, 25 or 30 divisions of American soldiers may be permitted to come home. They will probably be men who have been in combat for a long time, men who are wounded, and men who are battle-weary. They are entitled to come home. They have earned a rest, and, furthermore, they have earned the eternal gratitude of the American people.

So far as I know, there are no plans to use more than two-thirds of our soldiers. I should like to have some Senator tell me why the Selective Service, during the next year, should be permitted to control the lives of men between 30 and 45. Why should the Selective Service be now permitted to take men between 30 and 45, who have wives and children, and put them into the Army for a long period of training? The records show that they do not make very good soldiers anyway. If I had my choice between men 18 years old and those over 30, I would take those 18 years old every time, because they make better fighting soldiers. They do not know anything about fear. They can stand great hardships. A man over 30 must think of his wife and children. Service in the Army is tough on him. We really do not need him in the Army, and he ought not to be controlled by the military. The sooner the military authorities get it into their heads that the people of the country do not want to be ruled and controlled by the military, the better off we shall all be.

General Marshall did not make all the decisions with which he is credited. No one can convince me that he agreed to put 60 divisions into the fight against Germany, permitting our allies to contribute a maximum of 15 or 17 divisions. If anyone tells me that he agreed that

we should carry such a tremendous burden, I do not believe it. Some day the American people will find out what a tremendous contribution we have made in men and materials to the success of that fight. Without the contribution which we made, it would not have been successful. So we are justified in saying, "We put the boys in. We are suffering the casualties. Now it is time to give them some relief. They are entitled to it. They have earned it." An amendment will be offered to relieve men over 30 years of age from the draft regulations; and I shall vote for it.

I do not believe that what we do now will make much difference in the immediate future. I do not believe that what we do will be reflected on the war fronts very soon. We are already committed to the fight with what we have; and it will take quite a while. We have 5,150,000 American soldiers overseas. We have in this country only about 2,900,000 who can be sent overseas; and of that number 1,400,000 have been earmarked for overseas service. I am able to make that information public because the Secretary of War made it public. Up until a very short time ago I was unable to make that statement.

If we have experienced men available, why should we put 18-year-old boys into the line? Men who have not had sufficient training are more likely to be killed or become casualties. Every Army commander knows that men with insufficient training are more likely to be killed than men who have had a long period of good training. Inexperienced or insufficiently trained men do not know how to take care of themselves.

The Army justifies keeping these divisions in battle and infiltrating the divisions with younger men, on the ground that it is desired to keep pressure on the enemy. The enemy has been kept under pressure, which has brought about this victory. I am not certain that the Russians and Americans have not already joined forces somewhere in Europe. After they have joined forces, it will not be long before the fight will be over.

Mr. President, why should we permit the Selective Service to take men over 31 years of age, particularly men 38, 39, or 40 years old, away from their civilian occupations and train them to be sent into the fight? Actually such men cannot stand the hardships of combat service. They do the best they can, but they cannot do very much.

It seems to me that our situation should be canvassed again, and that we should do so without becoming angry with each other. Men can differ about these things. In the American Army we have perhaps between 90 and 100 divisions. We must have enough to win the fight against Japan. However, the war against Japan will be largely a naval war. There are 3,200,000 young Americans in the Navy. In the air forces we have an adequate supply of young men. Men have been taken out of the air forces and put into the Infantry. That was done because we underestimated the need for infantrymen and overestimated the need for men in the air forces. That was a mistake. I do not wish to quarrel

with anyone about it. In a gigantic operation of this sort, mistakes are bound to happen.

I think it is time for the Senate to re-examine the whole question and decide it again. The Army ought to be considerate of the obligations which we owe to the American people. Army officials do not like to entertain suggestions made by Senators. They avoid it by accusing us of trying to meddle with the strategy of the war.

Mr. President, the United States Senate has not failed in a single instance to give the Army every appropriation which has been requested since the beginning of the war, and even before that time. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee knows that the Appropriations Committee has not denied the Army or the Navy a single request for appropriations with which to prosecute the war vigorously. When a Senator feels that he should now reexamine the whole question and decide whether or not in the future we should permit the Army to continue its jurisdiction over the lives of our people, I have no objection, if the Senator believes that that is necessary. I do not think it is necessary now, Mr. President. I do not believe that it would do a bit of harm to the war effort to insist that young boys be given 6 months' training. During the last war they received 6 months' training before being shipped overseas. In addition, they received 2 months' training overseas, and then spent a month in a quiet sector. So in the last war the average American soldier received the equivalent of 9 months' training before going into combat.

In the last war we sent approximately 2,050,000 men overseas. This time, in February, the number was 5,150,000. I believe that we have reached the point where we can reexamine the whole problem. If I did not so believe, I would not vote for it. I am not going to follow along because General Marshall says this and some other man says that. We were told that it was absolutely essential to victory to pass the work-or-fight bill. I never believed it. I do not believe it now, because we will attain the victory without it.

So I must be granted the right to exercise my own independent judgment on public questions. I will not blindly follow. If I make a mistake, that will be my responsibility. The American people pay with the lives of their sons for the mistakes the military leaders make and for the mistakes the rest of us make. I do not wish to make a mistake, but I do not wish to follow blindly the judgment of someone else, when I have some judgment of my own.

I have the people's interest at heart. I must do what in good conscience seems to me best under all the circumstances.

I know my friend the Senator from Alabama does not wish to have the amendment adopted. I do wish to have it adopted. I do not think it will do any harm at all. I do not desire to have our armed forces begin to take boys under 17 years of age—children—into the service. When an amendment prohibiting that is offered, I will support it.

I am grateful to my friend, the Senator from Alabama, for giving me an opportunity to state how I feel about this matter.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course the pending amendment does not require a reexamination of our military policy in respect to what we have done about training men or building up our Army or using our Army. At this time I shall not delay the Senate by discussing the views which have been expressed by the Senator from Kentucky on the question of a reexamination of the whole subject. Of course, there is no Senator who does not wish every American boy, whether he be in the Army or the Navy, to have adequate and thorough training before he enters combat. That is what General Marshall insists has been the practice and the program of the Army, to wit, to give to every boy in the Army, as he expresses it, very intensive, thorough, and adequate training.

The question is whether we in the Senate at this late date, at this moment on the eve of victory, will now seek to attempt to impose our will and to lay down a prohibition on our military commanders and a prescription of what the training shall be. We have won our victories—great, magnificent, and incomparable victories—without the interference of the Congress, without the interference of the Senate, but by leaving the responsibility and the command of our armies in the hands of General Marshall and our other military leaders.

At the time when I was interrupted, I was reading from a statement by General Marshall which goes right to the heart of this very question. The statement was contained in a letter written approximately 30 days ago by General Marshall, but it could not have been more timely or have gone more directly to the heart of this question if it had been written this morning. I shall not reread that statement, but I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate, along with that statement, another one. This statement comes from the War Department.

The supply of manpower under 26 years of age fit for full military duty is practically exhausted, including men in the armed forces not in combat units. The men becoming 18 years of age each month constitute practically the entire source of additional manpower.

Had the War Department been restricted in the use of 18-year-olds in combat during the last 9 months, the offensive in Europe could not have been sustained at its rapid pace, which prevented the enemy from reorganizing and establishing new defensive lines which would have materially prolonged the campaign in Germany with a resultant heavy increase in casualties. Use of 18-year-old trained soldiers was essential in maintaining the combat divisions at effective combat strength since there were not sufficient physically fit men of other ages suitable for infantry work available.

The efficiency with which these replacements have functioned and the fact that the offensive power of the combat units absorbing them has not been lowered is convincing proof of the adequacy of their training.

I wish to say here that the records of the War Department show that there is no difference between casualties among 18-year-olds, casualties among 19-year-

olds, and casualties among 20-year-olds. The casualties for those age limits run on parallel lines. There is no difference as between casualties for those age limits.

Mr. President, what General Marshall has told us, what the War Department has told us, is that our armies were able to drive through the Siegfried line, to cross the Rhine, and to drive at the tremendous pace at which they have been going in Germany because there was placed on the War Department no such restriction as the pending amendment proposes to place. General Marshall and the War Department have said to us that if there had been such a restriction as that which the pending amendment proposes, our forces could not have gone forward and driven the enemy as they have; that they could not have won the victories they have won, and we could not be so near final victory as we are at this hour. They tell us that if the restriction proposed by the pending amendment had been placed on our armed forces, the war would have been prolonged, there would have been more fighting before the final victory, and that would have meant greater casualties and greater loss of the lives of our American boys.

In view of that testimony, are we now, at this crucial moment, when our armies are driving forward for the final knockout, to do what General Marshall tells us would mean to impair, to impede, to delay, to slow down the momentum, to paralyze the drive, to prolong the war, and to sacrifice the lives of American boys, whose lives can be saved if we in the Senate will not interfere? General Marshall in his letter to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], pleading that the amendment not be adopted, closed with the following words:

It is impossible to foresee all of the exigencies which may arise in the waging of war. Carefully laid plans are frequently upset. The administration of the affairs of 8,000,000 men is a tremendous task which prohibitions of this nature, particularly in view of the constant uncertainties involved in waging war, would make almost impossible of efficient management. Should an emergency develop, such as last December, the War Department would in effect be powerless to avert the failure of an operation or a possible disaster.

Mr. President, when final victory comes in Germany and when the war against Germany has been won, I, for one, will be willing to sit down with the other Members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and with the other Members of the Senate to make any kind of examination looking toward the use of our forces, perhaps the size of our forces, and the disposition and the constitution of our forces; but I say to you today, Mr. President, that at this crucial moment the Senate cannot afford to assume the terrific responsibility of going absolutely contrary to what Gen. George Marshall has said to us.

The Senate cannot assume the very grave responsibility of doing the very thing which he begs it not to do. More than any other man, General Marshall has been responsible for mobilizing, building, training, transporting, deploying, and placing into battle our armed

forces. More than any other man, he is responsible for the magnificent and incomparable victories which our armed forces have won. He now stands at this moment of impending victory, with our forces assaulting the enemy, and says to us, "At this crucial moment when I am getting ready to give the final knock-out blow to the enemy, please do not impede my efforts, or grab my hand and hold it back."

Mr. President, when the time comes to vote on this amendment we must decide whether we shall continue to allow Gen. George Marshall and other military commanders, who have conducted the activities of our armed forces with such incomparable success, to carry forward their activities to final victory, or at this crucial moment, do the thing which General Marshall begs us not to do, namely, set our will and our judgment against his and those of his military leaders who have commanded our armies with such brilliant success on the field of battle.

Mr. President, I hope that the Members of the Senate will carefully weigh the import of the vote which they are about to cast. Whether or not they wish to assume the responsibility of doing what General Marshall asks them to do, or invite disaster and catastrophe for our armed forces and thereby prolong the war at the cost of additional thousands of American lives, is a matter which Senators must decide for themselves. I plead, Mr. President, that we stand by our military commanders. We have stood by them from the beginning to the present hour. By repeated military successes they have won for us victory after victory. Let us continue to sustain and support them. If we follow such a course they will bring us the final victory for which we have prayed. They will bring it to us within the shortest possible time, and with the least possible loss of American lives.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I share completely the desire of the acting majority leader to support General Marshall. Throughout all the difficulties of the past few years I believe that no Member of this body has been more loyal in that support than myself. I believe that it has gradually become apparent to us that George Marshall is an institution in the same way that the President is an institution, and that he is very dependent upon many of his advisers. I believe we have been afforded ample evidence in recent days of the fact that, as regards the Congress of the United States, the advice given to George Marshall has not always been as adequate as it should have been. I have had profound sympathy for him amidst the enormous burdens which he has had to carry. I sat here sometime ago, following the course of the debate on the manpower bill, and saw only 18 Members on the opposite side of the Chamber who were ready to support our Chief of Staff, George Marshall. More and more it has seemed to me that an inadequacy has existed in connection with the advice which George Marshall has been receiving from his trusted aids regarding the legislative situation, as well as the situation generally throughout the country.

There do not pour over the desk of George Marshall the situations which confront us.

Mr. President, I propose to offer—but do not ask for a vote upon it until we shall have disposed of the pending amendment—an amendment dealing with a situation which, in my judgment, is fully as serious as the one which we are now discussing. I will read the amendment and then send it forward to the desk. It reads as follows:

Provided, That after May 1, 1945, there shall be no further draft of men over 31 years of age.

That amendment would place our position exactly in accord with the position announced by the British Government, of which we read within the past 3 days. Their position is that after May 1, 1945, there shall be no further drafting for military service of men who are more than 31 years of age. The British are near the scene of this great conflict; they are carrying grave responsibilities, and are insisting that they will continue to bear them until the conflict shall have come to a finality. I cannot resist the belief that, in the midst of the pressing shortages which prevail there, and their situation of limited manpower, if they are able to eliminate the drafting of men of more than 31 years of age there can be no reason why we in this country should not grant similar considerations to our young men.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I understood the Senator from Maine to say that a British law now upon the statute books would prohibit the drafting of men over 31 years of age.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; after May 1, 1945.

Mr. STEWART. Did the Senator state that such a law is already on the statute books of Great Britain?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. It has been announced that the law will take effect on May 1, 1945.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator now move the adoption of his amendment?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; I ask that it be considered later.

Mr. President, I have talked with General Hershey with regard to the manpower figure involved, and I have brought the information to the Senate so that we may understand what is in view. General Hershey has advised me that from May 1, 1944, through the ensuing 9 months approximately 5 percent of the draftees were more than 31 years of age. That is a very small number, of course. More recently that percentage has been increased as a result of our scraping the bottom of the manpower barrel. General Hershey estimates that in the past month or two it will run as high as from 10 to 15 percent.

On the other hand, it is also true that 9 out of 10 of those men are pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. In other words, most of the bachelors of more than 31 years of age have already been taken. We are now dipping into the age group of those who are married, who have depend-

ent children, in many instances three or four children, and who are of the age which General Marshall himself has testified is less desirable for military service. He has said that such men are not able to adapt themselves to the exigencies of modern warfare. We must also keep in mind—and this has been suggested to me in my discussion with various departments—that there is a constantly mounting pressure throughout the country in connection with various situations which have arisen.

I have today the case of a man 35 years old, with a wife and four children and a highly responsible position, who is being drafted. His sacrifice perhaps is no greater than that of many others; but let us look ahead a little. This aspect of the matter is arousing more and more concern, and if conditions continue as they are now, with the improved outlook on the German front, the pressure will become irresistible to release from the Army men over 31 years of age, or 35, who are least useful in military service. That will mean that having taken these men 1 month and perhaps trained them for 2 or 3 months, we will next proceed to discharge them. Meanwhile we have disrupted their home life and their economic associations. We are facing a situation that arouses difficulty in the country all out of proportion to any possible contribution which such men can possibly be expected to make.

So following the disposition of the pending amendment I shall ask that the Senate give consideration to this amendment in order that we may ameliorate in some measure the tragic situation which is being presented by the disruption of families to so unprecedented a degree at this very late hour so far as the war in Europe is concerned.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but, in view of all the proposals for a relaxation of the Selective Service Act and proposals to release from the Army certain age classifications or exempt them from the draft, I think this might be a good time to call attention to the fact that, even though tonight word may come of the unconditional surrender of Germany—and we hope it will come tonight, or in the next hour—yet to the westward lies our most formidable enemy, Japan, with an army of probably 6,000,000 trained men, an army that we have yet to meet in force, and an enemy that may take us many, many months to defeat.

It has been said here on the floor today that the war with Japan may be wholly a naval war. It will be a tough naval war and it will become tougher when we land on the coast of China and land on the Japanese islands proper.

I have much respect for the opinions of those who think that there should be some relaxation of the law, but it seems to me that all of us ought to remember that this war is far from over. We are about in the fourth inning of the game and have five more tough innings to go before the game is won. Because the war in Europe may be over, I hope that we will not let our emotions run away with

our best judgment. Although the military may be a little harsh, although they may make some mistakes in the estimates of what they need, it is better to have—and no one knows it any better than the military—too much than too little in this Japanese war.

It is pretty hard, as the Senator from Illinois has said time and time again, to eliminate the age categories. Every American is in this war to some degree, and if we start picking out certain categories we are bound to do injustice to others.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] seeks to exempt those over 31 years of age. I know men from 31 up to 50 years of age, men with families, who volunteered at the beginning of this war. When the war in Europe is over maybe they would like to leave the service and come home. They have done their turn. I hope that we will turn our eyes from the east and look to the west, where the toughest battle is still to be fought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Mitchell
Austin	Guffey	Moore
Bailey	Gurney	Morse
Ball	Hart	Murdock
Bankhead	Hatch	Murray
Bilbo	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Overton
Buck	Hill	Pepper
Burton	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capper	La Follette	Smith
Chandler	Langer	Stewart
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Tunnell
Ellender	McMahon	Walsh
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
Gerry	Millikin	Wilson

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] for himself and other Senators. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section at the end of the bill, to read as follows:

SEC. —. Section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "And provided further, That no man under 19 years of age who is inducted into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act shall be ordered into actual combat service until after he has been given at least 6

months of military training of such character and to the extent necessary to prepare such inductee for combat duty; this proviso shall not be construed as preventing the assignment of enlisted men of the Navy or Coast Guard and the reserve components thereof to duty for training on combat vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard and at naval bases beyond the continental limits of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LANGER. My colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], is unavoidably absent on business for the Government, in Pittsburgh. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is detained in a committee meeting. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent attending the funeral of his father.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco. He has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent visiting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent conducting hearings in Pittsburgh in behalf of the Senate. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is detained in a committee meeting.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a delegate to the International Conference at San Francisco. He has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent on official business. I am advised that both of these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

I am advised that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—50

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Chandler	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Walsh
Cordon	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

NAYS—25

Austin	Gurney	Maybank
Bailey	Hart	Mitchell
Ball	Hatch	Murdock
Burton	Hayden	Murray
Donnell	Hill	Overton
Downey	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McKellar	Taylor
Green	McMahon	
Guffey	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews	Mead	Tydings
Barkley	Myers	Vandenberg
Briggs	Reed	Wagner
Brooks	Saltonstall	Wheeler
Connally	Scruggam	Wherry
George	Thomas, Idaho	Willis
Glass	Thomas, Utah	Young

So Mr. STEWART's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

That, to the extent that the President deems to be (1) feasible, (2) compatible with military operations, and (3) necessary or desirable in order to make possible the education and training as physicians and dentists of as many persons as are necessary to provide the minimum number of medical doctors and dentists required to meet the essential needs of the civilian population (especially in rural areas) and the armed forces for medical and dental services in the future, the President is authorized to provide for the release from active duty in the armed forces of men who have completed more than 1 year of honorable service in such forces during the present war and who have satisfactorily completed a substantial portion of the medical, dental, premedical, or predental education and training necessary to qualify them as physicians or dentists, in order to enable such persons to pursue further such education and training. The release of any person from active duty for the purposes of this section may be conditioned upon his acceptance by an accredited school and the pursuit of such education and training in a satisfactory manner.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) In order to make possible the education and training as physicians or dentists of as many persons as are necessary to provide the minimum number of medical doctors and dentists required to meet the essen-

tial needs of the civilian population (especially in rural areas) and the armed forces for medical or dental services in the future, the President shall, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men who are found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be enrolled in the national medical and dental education program. The President shall provide for the enrollment, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, in a national medical and dental education program (hereinafter referred to as the "program") of such persons as he deems necessary to be enrolled in such program, in order that they may be deferred under this subsection from training and service under this act, subject to the following limitations:

"(1) (A) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year premedical education and training shall not exceed 8,000 at any one time.

"(B) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year premedical education and training shall not exceed 3,500 at any one time.

"(2) (A) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue second-year premedical education and training shall not exceed 8,000 at any one time prior to the end of the third month of the academic year and shall not exceed 4,500 at any one time after the end of the third month of the academic year, and after the end of such third month shall not include anyone who has not been accepted for admission to the earliest subsequent entering class of an accredited medical school following the satisfactory completion of such second-year premedical education and training.

"(B) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue second-year premedical education and training shall not exceed 3,500 at any one time prior to the end of the third month of the academic year and shall not exceed 1,750 at any one time after the end of the third month of the academic year, and after the end of such third month shall not include anyone who has not been accepted for admission to the earliest subsequent entering class of an accredited dental school following the satisfactory completion of such second-year premedical education and training.

"(3) No man shall be enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting him to pursue premedical or premedical education and training for more than 2 years.

"(4) (A) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year, second-year, third-year, or fourth-year medical education and training shall not exceed 4,500 in each of such classes at any one time.

"(B) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year, second-year, third-year, or fourth-year dental education and training shall not exceed 1,750 in each of such classes at any one time."

In determining the number of men who may be enrolled in the program, the President shall take into consideration and make due allowances for the number of physicians or dentists who may be obtained through the education and training of other persons not enrolled in the program, including veterans of the armed forces, women, and persons not qualified for military service. The limitation on the number of men who may be enrolled in the program shall not be deemed to be a limitation on the total number of students who may be enrolled in medical, dental, premedical, or premedical schools; but shall be deemed to be a limitation only on

the number of men who may be deferred under this subsection, who shall be in addition to students who may be obtained from other sources. Persons shall not be enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue medical or dental education and training at any schools except medical and dental schools whose graduates are acceptable to the armed forces for commissioning as medical doctors or dentists. The number of men who may be enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue each of the two respective years of premedical or premedical education and training shall be allocated by the President among the several States on the basis of population, as determined by the 1940 census. The men to be enrolled in the program from each State for the purpose of permitting them to pursue such education and training shall be selected from among applicants within such State, in such manner as the President may prescribe. In making such selections, representatives of accredited schools which offer full-time medical, dental, premedical, or premedical courses of instruction shall be consulted and their services may be utilized. No man who fails to make satisfactory progress in pursuing his education and training shall be permitted to continue to be enrolled in the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on February 26, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 637. The amendment which has just been read is that bill. When I introduced the bill last February I made a lengthy statement in respect to it. I stated at that time that the V-12 program and the A. S. T. P. program, which provided for medical students, were curtailed this year by the Navy and the Army, respectively, and would be dispensed with in 1946, and because of that fact there would be no way by which we could have attending our colleges the necessary number of students to study medicine and dentistry.

As I stated in February, prior to the war we had about 140,000 doctors to attend our civilian population. The Army has taken 60,000 of those doctors, and with some graduated since, we have now approximately 100,000 doctors to take care of our civilian population. Of that number of doctors, almost 40 percent are more than 55 years of age.

Mr. President, I consider the amendment a must measure. I think it is absolutely necessary that provision be made now so that our medical colleges throughout the country may obtain students and train them properly in medicine and dentistry. Unless this amendment is adopted and provision is made so that our colleges can receive by September of this year the necessary number of students to take courses in medicine, by 1948 the number of graduates from our medical schools will be reduced from an average of 6,200 to 4,200, and in 1949 the number of graduates will be reduced to 2,200. We cannot afford to let that happen. The only purpose of this amendment is to permit the President to defer not more than 8,000 students who are 18 years old or younger, in order to enable them to study medicine, and to defer 3,500 in order that they may study dentistry. That is the whole purpose of the amendment.

There may be a question in the minds of Senators as to whether it will be possible to obtain a sufficient number of

students from men classified IV-F, from women, or from returning soldiers. The records show that the maximum number that may be obtained from those sources is about 2,000. So, in order to be able to maintain a level of 6,000 graduates each year, it is necessary that deferments be asked for and obtained for medical and dental students.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the Senator, this amendment is in the terms of a bill previously introduced by him.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, the bill was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. That was in February.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. What committee action has there been in the intervening weeks?

Mr. ELLENDER. No committee action has been taken, the reason being, as was stated to me by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. THOMAS of Utah] that there were no reports from the departments affected. However, I have in my hand a report made by the War Manpower Commission under date of April 18, 1945, in response to a request for a report on the bill.

Mr. WHITE. When was the report submitted?

Mr. ELLENDER. The report was submitted about 3 or 4 days ago. The committee has not met since that time.

I desire to state further to the Senator that I discussed the matter with the Senator from Utah, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, before he went to Europe. He told me that he would raise no objection to this amendment; that, on the contrary, he was for it; and that he desired to have it considered by the conference, provided, of course, that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] were adopted. That was the only condition.

Mr. WHITE. The bill has been in committee for approximately 3 months, and we are now being asked to act, when the committee has not acted. Is not that a true statement of the situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has correctly stated the situation; but, as I have just indicated, the reason for the delay was that there was no report from the War Manpower Commission, from the War Department, or from other departments affected. However, as I have stated, it is imperative that we act at once on this measure if we are to maintain our present standard in the medical schools and obtain, after 1947, the number of graduates necessary in order to assure the minimum number of doctors required to provide medical care for our civilian population after the war.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am exceedingly sympathetic with the program which the

Senator from Louisiana is outlining. I wonder if he would care to state, if he has not already stated, how his proposal would affect those who are now in training in science.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would not affect them at all, for this reason, as I indicated when I began my remarks: The V-12 program and the A. S. T. P. program provided for medical students. Those programs have been in effect for a little more than 2 years. Those students who now are in school and are studying medicine would not be affected. The amendment would apply only to new students. In other words, in order to be able to obtain a sufficient number of students to begin their premedical studies and pre-dental studies by September, it is necessary that legislation be enacted now.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that my observation leads me to believe that as regards the dental students—and I consider the dental students to be equal in importance to the medical students—the program has been discontinued, and dental students in at least one instance in the District of Columbia—namely, at Georgetown University—are in civilian status, but are carrying on at their own expense the dental course which they started under military status.

Let me say one other thing—and then I shall not interrupt the Senator again—because I am sympathetic with his objective, and I wish to help him if I can. My observation is—and my information comes from very good sources—that there has been a strong tendency on the part of those in charge to discourage this program, and that some of the boys who now are in it are discouraged because it has been thrown in their teeth—and I use that expression advisedly—that they are getting an education at the expense of the Government, when they should be out in the front-line trenches or at some other place in military activity. That has been a discouraging feature to the boys who are carrying on their studies in such science courses and who, after they complete their studies—and they will do so if they have an opportunity—will serve their country as well as will anyone in the military service, because probably they will serve it longer than this war lasts; they will have to serve long enough to take care of those who, because of the war, are made incapable of taking care of themselves.

I am very glad the Senator is interested in the subject. I wish to have something done so that the boys will be treated decently when they enter such courses, and so that they will be regarded as in military service.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator realizes that if Congress acts in this connection, the instruction will be made official.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is official now, under the A. S. T. P. program.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that has been discontinued, and so has the V-12 program.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am seeking to have the program continued at the students' expense. If we do not do that, the situation will be, as I have indicated, that

in 1948, instead of having in our schools 6,000 college graduates studying medicine, we shall have approximately 4,200. We cannot afford to let that happen.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What would be the status of a young man who had been in medical school for 1 or 2 years, possibly under exemption by his local board, but not in the medical school at his own expense?

Mr. ELLENDER. He would remain there, and under my bill he would receive an exemption. The bill does not seek to reinstate the V-12 program or the A. S. T. P. program which was in operation last year and the beginning of this year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But there are any number who are not under any program, except they have been exempted by their local draft boards because of their prospect of becoming good doctors.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since July 1944 Selective Service, under a ruling of the National Director, has refused to defer any more men simply for the purpose of studying medicine. That is, there will be no more young men with a II-A classification enrolled in the future incoming classes. This ruling does not affect those already enrolled in medical schools and classified II-A. I would like to emphasize to the Senator that my amendment is designed to provide for those promising young men in whose welfare he has just indicated his concern.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator's amendment provides that these men shall be exempted so as to permit them to continue their studies. I wonder why we could not obtain such men from the group between the ages of 18 and 20 who are now in the military service.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill provides that a portion of them shall be selected from that group. I have taken care of that matter in section 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is good. I wanted to clear up that point.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will refer to page 2, which states:

The President is authorized to provide for the release from active duty in the armed forces of men who have completed more than 1 year of honorable service in such forces during the present war and who have satisfactorily completed a substantial portion of the medical, dental, premedical, or pre-dental education and training necessary to qualify them as physicians or dentists, in order to enable such persons to pursue further such education and training. The release of any person from active duty for the purposes of this section may be conditioned upon his acceptance by an accredited school and the pursuit of such education and training in a satisfactory manner.

We have taken care of that matter. If that provision does not suffice, we can release as many as 8,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So they would first be obtained from the service; would they?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And if not enough were obtained in that way, they could be exempted; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. President, now let me read for the RECORD a statement in respect to the bill made by Paul C. Barton, M. D., who is chairman of the Directing Board, Procurement and Assignment Service, War Manpower Commission. The statement reads as follows:

The War Manpower Commission, and particularly its Procurement and Assignment Service for Physicians, Dentists, Veterinarians, Sanitary Engineers, and Nurses, is on record as being deeply concerned about the future supply of medical and dental students.

The current regulations of Selective Service have the effect of limiting persons entering upon premedical and pre-dental education to women, physically disqualified males, and aliens. These categories are inadequate to supply a sufficient number of suitable premedical and pre-dental students to fill more than 25 or 30 percent of the available places in the medical and dental schools. Hence, when the classes enrolled under present conditions graduate from these professional schools, these graduates will be but a small fraction of the number of physicians and dentists normally added to these professions annually, and quite insufficient to meet even the normal pre-war needs of the country. These needs will exceed former normal needs in all probability.

In the first place, a greatly expanded military establishment will demand a far greater military medical and dental service than formerly. Compulsory military training would increase the demands further. Secondly, the number of veterans needing medical service will be very large. Third, the demands on the American medical and dental professions to assist in the rehabilitation of the countries ravaged by war will be imperative. Some of this work will undoubtedly be done in connection with military occupation, but for a number of years after the close of hostilities many of our highly trained specialists will be serving abroad in one capacity or another. Lastly, and most important, the expanded demands in the field of public health and general medical service on the part of the country as a whole will result in a far greater need for professional personnel than pre-war requirements. Available civilian physicians and dentists will suffer from increased death and disability rates both as a result of military service and as a result of the extraordinary home-front load being carried by some during the war.

While conscious of the needs of the Army and Navy for young men, the Procurement and Assignment Service has been apprehensive concerning the limitation of the number of premedical and pre-dental students, and has called the attention of Selective Service and the armed forces to the dangers involved in any policy which will limit the production of doctors and dentists necessary for adequate care of the country when the war is over. In this connection, attention is called to the attached correspondence.

I shall not take the time to read the correspondence, but it is very illuminating, and I hope Senators will read it. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The War Manpower Commission, and particularly its Procurement and Assignment Service for Physicians, Dentists, Veterinarians, Sanitary Engineers, and Nurses, is on

record as being deeply concerned about the future supply of medical and dental students.

The current regulations of Selective Service have the effect of limiting persons entering upon premedical and pre dental education to women, physically disqualified males, and aliens. These categories are inadequate to supply a sufficient number of suitable premedical and pre dental students to fill more than 25 or 30 percent of the available places in the medical and dental schools. Hence, when the classes enrolled under present conditions graduate from these professional schools, these graduates will be but a small fraction of the number of physicians and dentists normally added to these professions annually, and quite insufficient to meet even the normal pre-war needs of the country. These needs will exceed former normal needs in all probability.

In the first place, a greatly expanded military establishment will demand a far greater military medical and dental service than formerly. Compulsory military training would increase the demands further. Secondly, the number of veterans needing medical service will be very large. Third, the demands on the American medical and dental professions to assist in the rehabilitation of the countries ravaged by war will be imperative. Some of this work will undoubtedly be done in connection with military occupation, but for a number of years after the close of hostilities many of our highly trained specialists will be serving abroad in one capacity or another. Lastly, and most important, the expanded demands in the field of public health and general medical service on the part of the country as a whole will result in a far greater need for professional personnel than pre-war requirements. Available civilian physicians and dentists will suffer from increased death and disability rates both as a result of military services and as a result of the extraordinary home-front load being carried by some during the war.

While conscious of the needs of the Army and Navy for young men, the Procurement and Assignment Service has been apprehensive concerning the limitation of the number of premedical and pre dental students, and has called the attention of Selective Service and the armed forces to the dangers involved in any policy which will limit the production of doctors and dentists necessary for adequate care of the country when the war is over. In this connection, attention is called to the attached correspondence. The critical situation which now exists cannot fail to seriously arouse very serious concern on the part of all those who are interested in and responsible for the health needs of the Nation. The Procurement and Assignment Service, War Manpower Commission, is convinced that some such legislation as S. 637 is essential to meet the existing problem.

For FRANK H. LAHEY, M. D.,
Chairman, Directing Board,
Procurement and Assignment Service.
By PAUL C. BARTON, M. D.,
Executive Officer.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
PROCUREMENT AND ASSIGNMENT SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1944.
GOV. PAUL V. McNUTT,

War Manpower Commission, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR: At a joint meeting of the Procurement and Assignment Service on Saturday, April 8, 1944, with Surg. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, Surg. Gen. Ross T. McIntire, and Surg. Gen. Thomas Parran, the question of selective service ceasing to defer all physically acceptable premedical students and students in medical schools except those who will complete their senior year in 24 months was considered. It was the unanimous opinion of all three surgeons general and of the entire Procurement and Assignment Board that such a position on the part

of selective service would result in a situation which would be disadvantageous and even dangerous to the armed forces and to the civilian population. It was also unanimously agreed that I should write this letter to you and ask you to forward it to the President if such a course met with your approval.

We all feel that the continuing maintenance of medical schools and the production of doctors is of such importance that if anything such as their failure to defer men in medical schools and in premedical training but accepted by medical schools is to be done which may well interrupt this production of doctors and cause some medical schools to close that the Procurement and Assignment Board and the three surgeons general must be in a position of having warned against it. We all wish to go on record to the effect that should later developments such as an epidemic of great magnitude, war casualties of unanticipated numbers or any other unexpected demand upon medical manpower by the military or civilian population arise that they not be in a position of not having done everything in their power to have prevented this medical manpower production interruption.

This problem has been discussed with the Army and the Navy with the possibility that it can be met by the Army and Navy enlisting these premedical and medical students and placing them on an inactive status. Such a plan, if possible, would satisfactorily accomplish the protection of these men, save the Government the expense of their educations, make them available for the services on graduation and at the same time continue the production of doctors and preserve medical schools.

We do not believe that the places vacated in medical schools by the change in Army plans can be filled with women, IV-F's, I-AF's, and men discharged from the armed forces. Many medical schools are in a considerable part supported by student fees without which we are doubtful that they could continue.

We all feel that this is perhaps the most serious problem on which we have had to take a position and for that reason we feel it our duty to take an unequivocal position and request you to consider forwarding this to the President with your support.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK H. LAHEY, M. D.,
Chairman of the Directing Board.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
April 12, 1944.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director, Selective Service System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: Following the meeting of the War Manpower Commission Inter-Agency Committee on Occupational Deferralment yesterday, I reviewed the situation concerning premedical students again. Your telegram of April 11, 1944, appears to take care of all of the students now in school and all of those who will be entering classes up to July 1, 1944. The group of premedical students who will be entering classes starting through October concerns me most at the present time.

Our information indicates that there are between 1,200 and 1,300 premedical students who have been accepted by medical schools for classes starting between now and September 30, 1944. The vast majority of these students will not be entering school until September. Another group of about 1,000 have been accepted for classes between October 1 and December 31, 1944.

The urgency of preserving the flow of medical students is so great that I am writing to ask whether you would consider advancing the date from July 1, 1944, to October 30, 1944. If it is not possible to keep the medical schools filled to capacity with students deferred by Selective Service, it is my intention

to present to the Secretaries of War and Navy a request that they consider placing in the Enlisted Reserve a sufficient number of students to meet this urgent need.

We feel strongly that the public interest demands that places in the medical schools be kept filled to capacity. I know that you are thoroughly aware of the reasons which prompt my recommendation and of the seriousness with which the three Surgeons General, as well as the Board of the Procurement and Assignment Service regard the matter. I cannot emphasize this concern too strongly and I will appreciate it deeply if you will review the facts of the situation again, and give consideration to my instant recommendation. I would be very pleased to discuss this with you personally in case you desire to do so.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL V. McNUTT,
Chairman.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
April 15, 1944.

Hon. PAUL V. McNUTT,
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR McNUTT: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 12 with reference to my telegram of April 11, 1944. The telegram, as you indicate, provides that students in premedicine, pre dentistry, preveterinary medicine, preosteopathy, and pretheology may continue in a deferred status provided such preprofessional students will matriculate and enter into actual classroom work in a recognized school of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, osteopathy, or theology, on or before July 1, 1944.

It is noted that between 1,200 and 1,300 premedical students have been accepted by the medical schools for classes beginning April 12 and September 30, 1944, and that the vast majority of these students are scheduled for admission to medical school in September.

No exceptions will be made as respects the date of July 1. We shall, as in the past, give full faith and credit to the certificates of professional colleges as to the status of students matriculated therein and engaged in actual classroom work within the school or under its immediate supervision.

Sincerely yours,
LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
April 26, 1944.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of April 15, 1944, outlining the future Army specialized-training program. In reply I wish to set forth the existing situation concerning medical and dental students and the needs which must be met in the public interest.

The medical needs of the armed forces and of the civilians, for the duration of the war and the not-to-be-overlooked thereafter, are such that it is imperative that an uninterrupted flow of physicians and dentists be maintained. Already the ratio of physicians to population has reached the minimum considered safe by the Procurement and Assignment Service and the United States Public Health Service. Still more serious is the fact that this ratio is steadily increasing as a result of the death of approximately 3,500 civilian physicians annually, with less than 1,200 replacements available from the medical graduates ineligible for military service. A comparable situation exists regarding the dentists.

The reduction in the Army specialized-training program will have the effect of increasing the number of places which must be

filled by civilian medical students by 28 percent. The Navy will continue its contracts for 25 percent of the places and it is assumed that approximately 15 percent can be filled with women and men disqualified for military service. This will leave approximately 2,000 vacant places in the medical classes unless some provision is made in 1945 to provide deferment for the requisite number of premedical students. The following table summarizes the situation concerning medical students for this class:

Total number of places in entering classes 1945	6,500
Army will fill	1,825
Navy will fill	1,625
Women	400
Physically disqualified men	650
	4,500

Balance for whom other arrangements will be necessary— 2,000

Similar arrangement will be necessary for about 1,000 dental students.

Efforts have been made by the Procurement and Assignment Service and by me personally to convince the Director of Selective Service that his policy of recommending deferments of men under 26, as set forth in his telegram of April 11, 1944 should be modified to include students in premedical and predental courses in such numbers as to insure an uninterrupted flow so that the available places in the schools will be filled to capacity. Under date of April 15, 1944, the Director of Selective Service advised me as follows:

"No exception will be made as respects the date of July 1. We shall, as in the past, give full faith and credit to the certificates of professional colleges as to the status of students matriculated therein and engaged in actual classroom work within the school or under its immediate supervision."

This decision means that a large number of students now under deferment in premedical and predental courses will be lost to medicine and dentistry since the majority of them were registered for matriculation next fall. No provision whatever appears to be contemplated by Selective Service for students entering classes in late 1944 and in 1945. Copies of the correspondence between this office and Selective Service are enclosed for your information.

I need not stress to you the urgency and importance of maintaining the flow of medical students at a rate which will insure the necessary number of doctors for the country as a whole. If it were possible to shorten the course of medical education further or if we saw any way to make up for the loss which would ensue if nearly 30 percent of the medical students were lost for medicine for even 1 year, I would not suggest for your consideration the recommendation which I now wish to place before you.

The Directing Board of the Procurement and Assignment Service held a joint meeting with the three Surgeons General on Saturday, April 8, 1944, and unanimously recommended (copy of recommendation enclosed) that if the Director of Selective Service would not recommend deferment for a sufficient number of premedical and predental students that I request you and the Secretary of the Navy to give consideration to placing a sufficient number of these students on an inactive status in the Enlisted Reserve. It would be understood that the numbers would be held as small as possible and the machinery for allocating the students to the medical and dental schools would be handled through the Procurement and Assignment Service. The situation has become so serious that I now feel the time has come to make this request.

Since students will come under the jurisdiction of selective service when they reach their eighteenth birthday, the students we

wish to hold for this program will be chosen from the group under this age and can be taken into the Enlisted Reserve Corps and placed on an inactive status when they reach their eighteenth birthday. The total number involved in any one year, both under and over 18 years of age, would be about 4,000 premedical and 2,000 predental students.

The Procurement and Assignment Service suggests the following procedure for the administration and control of these students.

1. The Procurement and Assignment Service will establish a quota of authorized vacancies for each medical school—this quota to be the average number of students admitted by this school over the past 5 years, less the number of places to be filled by the Army, Navy, women, and men ineligible for military service.

2. Each medical and dental school will select and give acceptances to the number of students authorized by this quota; such selections being made from students under 18 years of age insofar as possible.

3. Enlistment of premedical and predental students in the Enlisted Reserve should be predicated on the issuance of a certificate of acceptance by a recognized medical or dental school. Continuation in the Enlisted Reserve would be dependent on maintaining a satisfactory standing in school.

4. The Procurement and Assignment Service will check acceptances of medical and dental schools against quotas to insure compliance with the schedule of students allowed.

I am sending a similar letter to the Secretary of the Navy and will deeply appreciate your early consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the critical situation which now exists cannot fail to arouse very serious concern on the part of all those who are interested and responsible for the health needs of the Nation. The Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission is convinced that the enactment of legislation similar to Senate bill 637 is essential if we are to meet the existing problem.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the measure, would those now in the service have the first call?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I would think so.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, a man now in the service who has served for a certain period of time and is in uniform and has the proper scholastic background might participate in this program, might he?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understood the reading of the paragraph providing that the President shall have the right to promulgate such regulations as to permit men in the service to be drawn from the service and to continue their medical education, I doubt whether the Senator is completely accurate, although I know he intends to be, when he says that the men in the service would have the first call, because unless the President acted under such permissive authority, the men in the service who had had 1 year of

medical education would stay in the service, and the men about to enter the service would be the ones who would be selected to receive such education. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator states, the language makes it permissive. My reason for making it permissive is that I should not wish to disturb or interfere with the Army in any way. The language of the amendment states, in part:

That, to the extent that the President deems to be (1) feasible, (2) compatible with military operations, and (3) necessary or desirable in order to make possible the education and training as physicians and dentists—

He shall do certain things.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the President, has such power without any act of Congress. The significant thing is that the War Department and the Navy Department have not asked the President to promulgate regulations which would take those men from the service. I believe it would be rather dangerous for us to make it mandatory because the obvious answer would come back that in many cases these premedical men are hospital assistants, stretcher bearers, and first-aid men, and that, therefore, to draw them from the service would, perhaps, result in an increased loss of life. So on second thought, I do not believe the Senator can handle the situation in any better manner than he is handling it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I do not believe that the men in the service will have the first call in the way that the Senator has indicated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe they would, because if they came within the purview of the section I have read, it would be an advantage to get men who have had previous training. I know of some who have had 2 years' study as premedical students, and a man who has had that much education, or at least that kind of education, could enter the medical school at once.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not if he is in the Army.

Mr. ELLENDER. I mean after he has been released from the Army. If his release were not incompatible with the best interests of the Army and would not disturb the Army, I have no doubt that preference would be given to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, of course the over-all picture boils down to this: A man of this type should be used where he can save the most lives. It is perfectly obvious that he can now save the most lives in the Army because in this war men die from disease, and others are constantly being wounded and killed. Quite frequently the wounds of soldiers result in death unless ample medical aid has been afforded. Although the purpose of the Senator is a worthy one, I doubt whether it would be feasible to draw any considerable number of men from the armed services which are already crying for nurses. I do not see how, in justice to the fighting men, we

could weaken the medical staff which the Army now has. It is not likely that a substantial number of the men who are now in the service would receive the privileges suggested in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. How does the Senator's amendment provide for inductees in the Navy? In other words, a part of the program suggested by his amendment would apply to the Army. Would it also apply to the Navy?

Mr. ELLENDER. No distinction would be made.

Mr. McCARRAN. If a young man called for the Navy should desire to take the science course, could he do so?

Mr. ELLENDER. Deferment would be given to 18-year-old boys.

Mr. McCARRAN. The language of the amendment would not put them into the military service?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then the A. S. T. P. would continue as is.

Mr. ELLENDER. The A. S. T. P. for medical education will admit no further students after September 1945. It will continue for those now enrolled until they have graduated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was not speaking with reference to premedical students in the Army or in the Navy. Such students are being used as hospital corpsmen, and in the performance of other duties. I had reference to the young man 18, 19, or 20 years of age who could qualify to enter medical school. Such a man is now in the service and perhaps has fought in several battles. I would place him against the man who is also 18 years of age but has the necessary qualifications to begin premedical studies. I think we should take care of the men who are in the service and wish to become doctors. I think they should be chosen as well as the men who are about to enter the service and have had a desire to receive medical training.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am interested in knowing the attitude of the Army and Navy in this matter. I assume that up to the present time the Army has been opposed to the plan of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator has said, no hearings have been held in connection with this matter. That is not because the Senator from Louisiana has not been diligent in pursuing the matter. I happen to know that he has been very diligent. But only this morning a letter came from the Navy Department in regard to this subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not had an opportunity to see it.

Mr. HILL. No; the Senator has not had an opportunity to read the letter.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not know that it had come.

Mr. HILL. I happen to know that the Navy Department is opposed to the amendment. It was only yesterday that

a letter came from the War Department. The War Department is also opposed to the amendment.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that I am always sympathetic with anything which he suggests. I should like to be helpful to him in his effort to work out the program which he seeks to have inaugurated; but I think the Senator will agree that even if the Senate, under the present conditions, should adopt his amendment and it went to conference there would be no opportunity for it to be agreed to in conference. The House has not considered the amendment, which originally was in the form of a bill. I understand that no hearing or consideration has been given to the matter. I am sure the conferees will not call in witnesses in order to determine what action they should take on the amendment. In view of the fact that several reports have come to us from various departments, I wonder if the Senator would not save time by having a hearing held and ascertaining whether he could not receive the favorable action of the committee. I believe the Senator stated on the floor yesterday that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would take the amendment to conference.

As the Senator knows, just by chance and fate I happen to be standing in the shoes of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at this particular moment. The Senator's statement presents a somewhat embarrassing situation to me. I do not like to find myself not in accord with something the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee, wishes, but merely to take this amendment to conference I do not think would get the Senator from Louisiana anywhere, because with all the opposition expressed to the bill by the different departments, I do not believe the conferees would accept the amendment. I do not see how the Senator can hope to get anywhere with it.

It seems to me we owe it to the Senate, we owe it to ourselves, to let the Senate Committee on Military Affairs have hearings on the bill, consider the bill, and then take action on it. I wonder whether the Senator does not feel that way about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator just stated, I have been making every attempt to have the Committee on Military Affairs consider the bill, and that is my reason for trying to press the matter. As I indicated in the early part of my remarks, unless we act soon, the class of 1948 and the class of 1949 will be short from 2,000 to 4,000 doctors and half as many dentists. The amendment was drafted by me in conjunction with the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association, and I wrote to every medical college in the country. With only one exception, they have replied favorably, stating that there should be a law of this kind; that it is imperative.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I take it the committee has not been in a position to act because

it has been waiting on the reports from the departments. The reports have come in. The War Department report came in yesterday, and the report from the Navy Department came in today.

I am not chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, but as one member of that committee I say to the Senator that if he will withdraw his amendment. I shall do everything I can to have the committee give him an expeditious hearings, expeditious consideration, and expeditious action on the bill. I do not know what the action will be, but certainly it would seem to me that, with a bill of this nature, with the interested departments all reporting against it, if the Senator really wants to have his bill passed, he will have to get the weight of the committee behind it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought I had that, because I have spoken to most of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and, as a matter of fact, I consulted many other Members of the Senate. I have heard no opposition from any of them, because they realize the necessity of keeping in the medical schools and dental schools a sufficient body of students so that a normal number of doctors and dentists can be graduated.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am one of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs with whom the distinguished Senator consulted, and I am indeed very much impressed by the necessity for the enactment of the bill, as pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana. But if the words of wisdom from our present acting majority leader are correct—and it would seem they probably are—then, even though the Senate adopted the amendment, and it were rejected in conference, of course, no time would be gained by making it a part of the pending bill. I am wondering if a definite agreement could not be made at this time that the Committee on Military Affairs would take up the bill, let us say within less than a week, and give it immediate consideration and pass upon it. So far as I am presently advised, I shall be very anxious to support the Senator from Louisiana in the attempt to pass the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs until the return from Europe of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I may say that if I am still acting chairman next Tuesday, and the Senator from Louisiana is ready to have his bill considered by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs next Tuesday, it will be called up. Of course, there are plenty of "ifs" in my proposal, because I do not know how soon the Senator from Utah will return, but as a member of the committee, not speaking now as its acting chairman, I am very much in accord with the objectives of the bill. I have an important amendment which I desire to have inserted in the bill before I can wholeheartedly support it, but I do not

think there will be any difficulty about working that out. As one member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I assure the Senator I am very much in sympathy with his bill.

I think the acting floor leader has stated the situation precisely as it is, that no time would be gained by taking the amendment to conference. With the adverse reports from the War Department and the Navy Department, without action by a standing committee of the Senate, we would be in a very bad situation when we faced the conferees from the House, because I know from experience that they are very tough conferees.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado and I have sat quite a few times with conferees on the part of the House, we know the difficulties encountered in conferences, and we know how well armed we must be with the facts if we are to induce the House conferees to agree. If we should take to conference an amendment such as this, when we would have to admit that it had had no hearings and no consideration by our committee, I think the House conferees would merely laugh and say, "Gentlemen, there is absolutely nothing doing, there is no use even talking about the matter."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in view of the assurances which have just been made to me, and the support which seems to be in the air, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana withdraws his amendment. The bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have an amendment on the desk which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator another copy of the amendment?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; there is only one in existence.

Mr. TYDINGS. Someone has taken the amendment from the desk for research purposes.

Mr. BREWSTER. I can restate it. It provides, "Provided, That after May 1, 1945, there shall be no further draft of men over 31 years of age." That is the amendment.

Mr. President, I have already explained, I think, to most of those who were present, the occasion for the amendment. I regret that it was not earlier presented to the Committee on Military Affairs, but the situation was not brought home to me, and I based it primarily upon the fact that the British have found this feasible and have put it into effect as of May 1, 1945.

I took the matter up with General Hershey. As I have previously stated, the number of men now being secured in the 31- to 38-year category is not given. Hitherto it has been about 5 percent, now it is running 10 to 15 percent. It is true that all these men are married men, most of them with pre-Pearl Harbor children, so that the situation is increasingly upset both from a domestic stand and from an economic standpoint, because they are men in the older-age

brackets, and they are also the men least valuable for military service.

I hope the acting majority leader may feel that he can take the amendment to conference. If there are serious objections, which can be presented by General Hershey or other military authorities, it will be in order to consider them, but I do think we are fully warranted in at least asking that this matter be seriously considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Since a copy of the amendment is not available, will the Senator state it?

Mr. BREWSTER. It is in this form, "Provided further, That after May 1, 1945, there shall be no further draft of men over 31 years of age." That is the amendment, and I understand that is precisely the practice which the British are establishing as of May 1, 1945, and this is confirmed by General Hershey. It seems to me that, in the interest of comity with our ally, it would do very much to allay the feeling which is so apt to prevail if we in this country, with our vast resources compared to theirs, and aware of their great responsibilities, should at least show that we can adopt a measure of this kind.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Maine to indicate that the figures from General Hershey showed that at the present time, the current month, these men who would now be excluded from the draft, or would be excluded after May 1, constitute from 10 to 15 percent of the draft; that, therefore, the amendment would result in cutting the draft from 10 to 15 percent?

Mr. BREWSTER. No; I do not understand that, because these men will be taken from other sources.

Mr. BURTON. Does the Senator mean more 18-year-olds? There are no more 18-year-olds.

Mr. BREWSTER. I assume that in the orderly progress of the draft all the men who are available are not taken each month, and that it is a question of what categories they are taken from. It was pointed out to me by eminent authority, which I shall not name, that the pressure in this matter is increasing very rapidly as the result of the disruption of families; that men with three or four children are being taken, and that it is anticipated that within a very short time, if conditions continue as they are now, legislation will be pressed, and it is believed favorably considered, which will discharge such men. We will, meanwhile, have spent 1 or 2 or 3 months in training them. General Marshall has always insisted that they are the least desirable because being older they are not able to adapt themselves. Consequently we will have taken them in for an entirely futile purpose. It seems to me that it would be very wise at this time to adopt the same policy as that of our very distinguished ally.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, one feature of the action of the British Government to which the Senator from Maine has referred is administrative action and not legislative action.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does that affect the wisdom of the judgment?

Mr. HILL. No. That may not affect the wisdom.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish we had an equally wise administration.

Mr. HILL. In the House of Commons on April 12 last Mr. Bevin, who is Minister of Labor, made a statement. Senators may remember that England has a system which is somewhat different from ours. England has not only the selective service for her military and naval forces, but she has what is called the universal service. In England men are drafted into industry and into work of all kinds. They have a universal service act. Some of the men go into the armed forces. Some may go into war plants. Some may operate the railroads and some may operate the busses. These is a different system in Britain from that which prevails in the United States.

Mr. Bevin said:

In general, as from May 1, 1945, I do not propose to call up any more men born in 1914 or earlier, except insofar as they may be required to meet the demands of the forces for tradesmen or specialists or for other special reasons.

Under the Selective Service Act today the President of the United States has the power not to call up any men in the 31-year age group or the older groups. The Senate will recall that as the Selective Service Act was passed in its original form it provided for the drafting of all men from 21 to 45, but a provision was placed in the act giving to the President of the United States the power, if he wished to use it, to defer any age groups he thought should be deferred. As will be recalled when the age limit was first reduced from 45 to 38 years, the reduction was made by an Executive order of the President of the United States. The President of the United States, by authority given in the Selective Service Act, reduced the age limit for inductees from 45 to 38 years. The President has the power today, if he sees fit, to reduce the age limit from 38 to 31 years.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. A moment ago, when I inquired of the Senator from Maine if the fact that the amendment would stop the drafting of about 10 or 15 percent of the draft men over 31 would mean a reduction of the draft, his reply was no, it would not reduce the number drafted, but would place the pressure on other groups. I would assume therefore that instead of testing men in accordance with whether they were engaged in essential industries, the test would be shifted by this amendment to the question of age, and that therefore it would exclude men of 31, regardless of what they were doing, but would make up the 10 or 15 percent reduction by taking men from whatever industries they were in, and thus aggravate the manpower situation with respect to war production.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, the very point which the Senator from Ohio has made is, I think, sufficient in itself to show that we ought not to adopt the amendment without having it considered by the Committee on Military Affairs. Hearings should be had on it. We should not act upon it without knowing exactly what the full effect of the amendment will be.

As the Senator from Ohio has stated, if we now by law defer men 31 years of age and older, that will mean that we will have to obtain more men in the age groups under 31 years of age. It might mean that we may have to take men from essential industries, from which we do not want to take them. It might aggravate the manpower situation which now exists. It might place more burdens on the youngsters we have talked about so much today and about whom we have been so concerned that they shall be given proper protection.

Mr. President, an amendment of this kind ought to be considered by a committee. Hearings ought to be had on it.

Let me say further that there are men who have been overseas for 2 years, some for more than 3 years, many of whom have gone through all the hardships and the travails and the dangers of what we know as warfare. We must consider now whether we are going to let those men come home, perhaps discharge many of them, after saying to them, "Well done, good and faithful servant. You have done your part. Now we will let serve overseas some other men who perhaps have not been in the armed forces at all, or certainly who have not been subject to such travail and hardship and danger as you have been who have served across the seas for these many months."

We ought to examine the whole situation. I hope the Senator from Maine will not insist on his amendment this afternoon, because the amendment goes to the whole question of what armed forces we will have after the war in Germany is over, how we will employ our armed forces, what use we will make of our manpower, and what we are going to do to the men who have served so long and so faithfully, and who have suffered so much.

Mr. President, as Senators know, we have in the Pacific today men who have suffered much from malaria fever. They have had the fever not once, not 3 times, or 6 times, but some of them have had malaria 15 or 20 times. They have undergone all kinds of suffering, all manner of hardships. Until we have first given consideration to those men and have sought to do everything we can to get them back home we should not peremptorily, simply by a stroke of the pen, without knowing all the facts, defer all men over 31 years of age.

That is what is involved in this amendment. I cannot bring myself to take this action. It may be that after I sit as a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and hear all the testimony, going into the entire situation, I will favor the Senator's

amendment, but I cannot do so this afternoon. I do not think it would be fair to the Senate. I do not think it would be fair to the men in the armed forces to say now, without more consideration for those men, that we are to defer all men 31 years of age and over. Many of those men are not married. Many of them have no families.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the Senator is in error. Practically all the bachelors have already been taken. This was the statement which General Hershey made to me—I think perhaps the acting majority leader did not hear it; but General Hershey stated that 9 out of 10 of the men over 31 years of age now being taken not only are married men, but are married men with pre-Pearl Harbor children. So they have every claim to our consideration. That is one of the reasons why I urge that the Senate consider the question carefully.

Mr. HILL. That is what I am asking the Senator to do. I am asking the Senator to let us consider it carefully. I am asking the Senator not to press this amendment now, when it is absolutely impossible to consider it carefully. The only way we can consider the amendment carefully is to have a committee sit around a table and listen to General Hershey, the head of the Selective Service, and representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the Manpower Commission, so that we can understand exactly what the situation is.

I am concerned about civilians at home; but I am more concerned about the men who for so many months have been in fox holes in the Pacific area and across the other seas. I want to consider them. I want to know what effect this amendment would have on them, and what, if anything, it would do so far as postponing their discharge or their return home is concerned. Many of them are married. Many of them have pre-Pearl Harbor children. Let us consider this proposal as it ought to be considered, in an intelligent, understanding, and careful way. With all the facts before us we can then act. We should not act on the spur of the moment by inserting such an amendment as this in the pending bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure that I recognize the persuasive character of the appeal. I am sure also that no one is more anxious than I about the young men who have been overseas for 3 years, and who have wives and families at home.

Mr. HILL. I am sure of that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know that many other Senators share my feelings.

Mr. HILL. I am sure of it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am afraid that the acting majority leader, for whom I have great respect, in his zeal to keep the bill intact, is somewhat exaggerating the complexity of the situation.

The amendment is very simple. The facts are very clear. General Hershey can give the Senator all the relevant facts over the telephone in 5 minutes.

He has them at his fingertips, as I discovered when I consulted him.

There are also certain other considerations which are quite persuasive. I hope that the acting majority leader, who is very eloquent, and who possesses a profound understanding of military matters, will yield to my persuasiveness and take the amendment to conference. I am sure that the committee of conference, in its deliberations, will be able to determine very quickly and very clearly whether or not we should take this step. If our great ally, with limited resources, is able to eliminate from the draft men over 30 years of age, why cannot the United States, with its vast manpower resources, take parallel action? We should endeavor, so far as possible, to eliminate the irritations and frictions which are constantly arising. Canada, our neighbor to the north, has not had the draft at all. All along the border we are constantly being reminded of that fact, which is most unfortunate. After deliberating carefully, England, with the wisdom which she possesses by reason of being close to the scene of action, has taken action similar to that which is now proposed.

I am sure that if the acting majority leader will ponder this question overnight he will feel that it is wise to take this amendment to conference, to see whether or not it would be advisable to include it in the bill.

Mr. HILL. My friend from Maine is so eloquent and persuasive that I wish I could find myself in accord with him. However, I do not feel that it would be the part of wisdom for the Senate to adopt this amendment, or to agree to send the amendment to conference. Unless we are in a position to know that we can defer these men, we ought not to give them the hope, because of action by the Senate, that they will be deferred. I do not believe that an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act of such far-reaching nature, fundamental as it is, ought to be adopted without the committee at least considering the amendment. That is my feeling in the matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator will take the amendment to conference. If he does not take it to conference, I hope the Senate will send it to conference. I do not believe it would necessarily mean that we would have to place burdens on other classes if we were to reduce the age limit under the draft to 31 years. It seems to me that we now have available in the Army all the men we will need to finish this fight.

It has been stated—and I believe it to be true—that other countries are not taking men above the age of 31, because time is required to train them, and their service in the armed forces involves a burden on them and on their families. There was a time when the age limit was reduced to 28. As I recall, that was about 2 months before Pearl Harbor. No objection was made at that time to reducing the age limit to 28. Many men

older than 28 were released. Of course, when the war came, they were taken back into the service very quickly. These men who are being taken away from their wives and children are not trained. They cannot be of any great use for 6 or 8 months, or perhaps a year.

It has been suggested—and I believe it to be true—that a third of our divisions will be partially demobilized when the war is over in Germany. We are permitting a continuation of control over the lives of men between the ages of 31 and 45 which I do not believe is justified by the military situation; and I will not vote to continue it.

I do not wish to insist on my friend doing something which, in his capacity as acting majority leader, he does not wish to do. In my opinion, consideration of the amendment by the conferees would not consume enough time to make much difference. This is a bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act for a year. The amendment can be considered in conference. If I am a member of the conference, I shall vote to retain the amendment in the bill. If the acting majority leader does not feel that he can take the amendment to conference, I hope the Senate will send it to conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have not heard any factual basis to support the assertions which have been made by Senators. One very important question is, how many men between the ages of 31 and 45 are physically competent for full military service?

Another question is, how many such men are now being inducted for full military service?

Another question is, are such men inducted for partial military duty and assignment to necessary military duties of a noncombatant nature, which they are fully competent to perform, although they are not physically able to engage in military combat?

I have before me a statement which indicates that the policy of the War Department is not to call such men for full military service. It is found on page 3568 of the RECORD for April 19, 1945:

As of February 1, 1945, our estimated reserve of civilian manpower fit for military duty and within the effective combat ages of 18 to 25, inclusive, was down to 279,000 men, of whom 133,000 were aged 18. Besides this, there will be available only those who become 18 years of age each month.

Mr. President, the war is not over. VE-day will make only the first half. As in a football game, we shall have to take a new breath and take a new, firm hold on the situation, and become refreshed, if possible, to begin the second half.

Today we are treating this matter as if the war were easy. Let our colleagues who will come back from abroad and will describe the scene they have witnessed tell us whether the war is easy. I will guarantee that they will tell us of men who are worn out, who are entitled to a respite and a chance to catch their breath.

How are we to fill their places except by using the group of men 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 years of age, which the Army is now using? We will not meet the

need by using these from 21 to 33 years of age.

But, Mr. President, here is the mischief of the thing: If such men are removed from the scope of the Selective Training and Service Act, they cannot be deferred for necessary employment. It is just another way of crippling the United States in its very great effort. Do not compare the United States with Canada, do not compare the United States with Great Britain, in the effort and the magnitude of the battle which is being waged here on the home front. We have no other recourse at the present time except the deferment for employment which is provided for in the existing law.

The group of men from 31 to 35 years of age who have registered and have come up for selection should not be exempted from the possibility of having the Government say to them, "We select you to do something other than to fight. You are over 31 years of age. You are needed in a factory which is manufacturing necessary munitions. You are deferred from military service for that cause." That is equivalent to selecting a man to perform that work. As long as he stays on that job he will not be reclassified for some other work or sent into military service.

But if the amendment is adopted, we will have made just another attack upon the ability of the Government to carry on this war to a successful conclusion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The statement of the Senator from Vermont is very illuminating. It indicates to me, at least, that the question at the moment is an economic one, not a military one. It is the desire to continue the control over the people of the United States. The people of the United States do not need to be controlled in that way. The people of the United States, using voluntary methods, have outproduced not only all our friends but all our enemies and all our enemies combined, and the people of the United States will continue to do so until the end of the war.

I object to having the Selective Service System used as a means of controlling the lives of the people of the United States and forcing them to do what someone wants them to do, when it is not necessary to proceed in that way at all. All we have to do is to tell the people of our country what is necessary, and they will do it, and will do it voluntarily. They have proved that over and over again.

So I repeat that the matter is an economic one, not a military one.

The Senator has indicated the reason for it, rather than the urgent need. Certainly there is no urgent need at this moment for soldiers on the European front. If there is, they are not going to get there from the United States.

We are told that we should not speak of what the other countries are doing. If they were doing more, perhaps we would not have to do so much. I must speak of that, because in some places we alone have almost completely kept the pressure on the enemy.

I object to having the Army use the Selective Service System as a club over the heads of men between the ages of 18 and 45. It is not just, and I will not support it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to record myself as wholeheartedly in support of the excellent statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I wish to add just a few words.

The question is not an economic one and it is not a political one, either. It is not a personal one. It is a military one.

On the first day of the present week, when the President of the United States made his first address to Congress, I thought that the high moment of that address was the tremendous and, as I thought, the unanimous applause which greeted the following statement which he made:

We are now carrying out our part of that strategy under the able direction of Admiral Leahy, General Marshall, Admiral King, General Arnold, General Eisenhower, Admiral Nimitz, and General MacArthur.

Then the President said:

I want the entire world to know that this direction must and will remain—unchanged and unhampered.

If I understand what has been going on here this week, and especially the last 2 days, the Senate has been doing a pretty big job of hampering the noble men, the trusted men, upon whom our country has imposed, in this great hour, its defense, its honor, and all its future. I may not only say we have undertaken to hamper them, but I hope I shall be forgiven for saying that this afternoon when we adopted an amendment by a vote of 50 to 25, we took a step which might well be interpreted here at home and in this Chamber and abroad and around the world as actually proposing to hobble them in the supreme hour of the national and the world crisis.

Mr. President, what will be the consequences if we continue to proceed along these lines? What will be the consequences if we adopt an amendment of such a sort? I am happy that one amendment has been withdrawn, and I appreciate the action of the Senator who proposed it in withdrawing it. What will be the consequences if at this time, of all the times in the long and trying progress since December 7, 1941, we signalize to our allies, we signalize to our enemies, we signalize to our fighting men, and we signalize to our own people that the Senate of the United States is complacent, is relaxing, is letting up, is retreating? We would retreat; we would get into the hideout at home, but we would bid the brave boys to go onto the battlefields and die. It is unspeakable. It is inconceivable. It is unthinkable. It is abhorrent. It stirs my heart more deeply than I should like to admit. Shall we tell the Japanese, with an army of 8,000,000 men who are ready to meet us and who are making every preparation to resist our impending invasion of their

islands or the coast of Asia, that we are letting down here in America? Shall we tell the boys whom we have sent to those far-away shores that we intended to modify our course, that we are going to look after the medical schools, that we are going to see that the medical schools shall be filled with students next year? I suppose that subsequently we shall be asked to take pains to see that the theological schools shall be filled with candidates for the ministry while our boys die on foreign battlefields. There might be some popularity to such a course, Mr. President, but I shall not suggest that anyone entertains such a thought. However, in my judgment, when those men return we will have to give answer to them. I hope they will measure us by the standard by which they are measured. They will have a right to do that. If the soldier flinches he is dishonorably discharged. If we flinch we should expect no less. We should ask for a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to take any steps which would tend to convince our people at home that the war is over. The war in Europe is not over. We cannot afford to take any step which would convince the people of America that the standards of England in this matter are our standards. I do not say that by way of reproach. I think the British have done very well. We cannot afford to do anything which would convince our people that our standards are unlike those of Russia. I am not ashamed to say that.

Why does this war have the fair prospect which it has at this hour? Russia poured out lives and retreated for 3 years. Now she is in the streets of Berlin. We are thinking that the war is somewhere nearly over. We pray, and we hope that is so. But the Japanese do not think the war is nearly over. I suspect there are people in Germany today who still entertain hopes of winning the war. They think that we will divide politically. Last Monday we undertook to signalize to the world in the presence of the new President that Republicans and Democrats, northerners and southerners, isolationists and internationalists, were united behind the chieftain upon whom the country had reposed responsibility. Through the words of our President, and the applause of our hands, we gave assurance to the world that the war will go forward unhampered. Yet, a week has been spent here on a legislative proposal which should have been disposed of very quickly.

Mr. President, there is nothing wrong with the selective service. It is and should be all-embracing. We began this war by pledging everything in this country to the winning of it. We have no right to presume to change that pledge until the eagles of victory are perched upon our banners in the hands of our returning sons. We have no right to take any step here in an assumption that we shall win the war by retreating on the home front. We know that we shall have won the war when the German power to resist and conspire has been utterly extinguished. We know that we shall have won the war when the Japanese have not only lost their faces, but have lost their hearts and their power

to fight for a hundred or 500 years to come. Because the news is good and our hearts are hopeful, some of us think that we can relax and that we can retreat. Mr. President, that is the way in which wars are lost. That is the only way in which we can lose this war. No one in America is now asking us to play politics, or to think of ourselves. I do not believe the medical schools are really asking us to think about them at this time. It is a matter of small concern whether they graduate 50 percent or 60 percent next year, or the year following. It is a matter of great concern that there shall be equality in America, that we shall marshal our manpower, man by man according to his capacity.

Mr. President, think of us here this evening. We are asked to consider a proposition without a word with reference to it having been received from the War Department or from the Navy Department. So far as I know, the word which we have received has come from the one man in America who is least qualified to advise us; namely, the War Manpower Commissioner. We are asked to take his word as a basis for beating a retreat in this hour of hope. That is not like the United States Senate, Mr. President. It is not like the people of the United States. It is not like the mothers and fathers. I know how they feel. The dearest wish of their lives is that they may see their sons again. Some of them will be content to close their eyes for ever more on the horizon of life if they may be allowed to see their sons again. But they do not ask us to relax. Relaxing is not what has made this country the glorious country she has proved to be during the past 4 years—these long and terrible years. It does not reflect the spirit of the boys on the land, on the seas, or in the air.

God forbid that you or I should say or do anything, or cast a vote or contemplate casting a vote, tending to indicate to our enemies, our allies, or our fighting men that we are capable of having such a spirit—one so different from that of our fighting men, so different from the spirit of the people of this country.

We misunderstand our country, Mr. President; we misapprehend America, if we do not realize that when America got into this war she set about—man, woman, and child—in every hamlet, in every home, to carry it through, with honor, to success and to glory. We are not going to stop now. We are not going to pursue a policy of modification based upon a foolish optimism and a casual hope.

Mr. President, I think we have gone far enough. We have heard these amendments. Some have voted one way and some another. I have no quarrel with any Senator about how he votes, but I think the hour has come when we must say within our hearts whether the Senators of the United States shall prepare to go forward with the captains in the field, the mothers and fathers in the homes, and the people everywhere who make this country the greatest of all the countries on the face of the earth.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am profoundly sorry to find myself in

disagreement with the three distinguished colleagues of mine who have spoken, whom hitherto I have followed with devotion through all the stormy seas of the past few years, particularly as we marched down into the valley of death with the manpower bill, which I introduced with my distinguished colleague from North Carolina here a year ago, and supported a bill presented by the Senator from Vermont in a somewhat more modified form, and for which I fought until there was no longer any opportunity to fight.

I am somewhat puzzled, however, by the general staff here that is conducting the opposition. First the acting majority leader pleaded very eloquently, and with all the earnestness and sincerity which he possesses, that this amendment, which would eliminate from the draft those over 31, was very wrong because it might make it impossible to discharge some of our boys overseas, in other words, that men over 31 would take some of their places. That is something to consider and to think about, although I think a little contemplation will indicate that that is not likely to be the case.

When we came to the second champion, he eliminated that entirely. The Senator from Vermont said that had nothing to do with the matter, there was not any question of men over 31 taking the places of any of our sons who were at the front and wanted to come home, but it was only to keep these men in some other form of economic service or limited military service. So that the Senator from Alabama tossed out his argument, and we have the economic and limited military argument of the Senator from Vermont. To what extent there may be supporting data is a matter of speculation, but it is certainly quite different from the earlier consideration suggested.

Then we come to my colleague from North Carolina, and his entire plea, as I understand, was based on the fact that this would be raising the flag, if not of surrender, at least of retreat, and that it would be betraying our allies. I think he used the words that it would be going back on our allies, and they would not understand it, though the Senator from Vermont said to forget about Canada and Britain. That, it seems to me, is the argument which has been presented.

Mr. President, the information which we have is that Britain has already discontinued the drafting of men over 31 after May 1, and that Canada has never inaugurated the draft, or has only a very limited draft. I am not saying this in criticism of either of those countries. The consideration which I wish to urge very earnestly, particularly upon my good neighbor from Vermont, is that we are going forward into the question of whether or not we shall arrive at an accommodation among the nations as a result of the deliberations now proceeding near the Golden Gate. Soon we shall have back here, we trust, a treaty in which we shall seek to achieve the great goal of ordered progress of the nations.

It is my sober opinion that the more nearly we can eliminate the causes of irritation and misunderstanding among our friends and among ourselves, the greater contribution we shall make to the adoption by the Senate, by any overwhelming majority of the treaty.

I, as one, merely wish to suggest to the Members of this deliberative body that they ponder what is to be the reaction of the people of this country if we here in America are being asked, by the rejection of this amendment, to take a position regarding the offering of our sons as a sacrifice in the fighting lines which neither Britain nor Canada at this time is carrying out. There may well be a difference in our circumstances, but I do not think anyone can explain to the American people why we are compelled to go forward with this draft at a time when both our great allies have determined it is no longer necessary to the successful prosecution of the war. The suggestion that we are retreating it seems to me is refuted by the logic of events.

In view of these facts, Mr. President, I hope the amendment may prevail, may go to conference, and there be considered by the committee of conference, which I am sure will be able to pass properly upon it.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I wish to place myself in harmony with the statement of the Senator from Vermont and that of the Senator from North Carolina. I am not one of those who believe we can win the war by comparison with what some other nation is doing. I do not believe we can rely on the failure of Great Britain or the failure of any other nation to do something as a justification for our not doing it.

I wish to say, in reply to something that was said by the Senator from North Carolina, that I am 1 of the 50 who voted for a guarantee of training to the boys who are still young. For that vote I have neither regrets nor apologies, but I believe that the adoption of the pending amendment would go far toward having a wrong effect both on our enemies and on our friends and our allies. I believe the policy which we have followed in winning the war thus far should not be suddenly changed, just at a time when the San Francisco Conference is meeting, and just at the beginning of a new administration, particularly after we have pledged ourselves to go forward in the winning of the war.

So I am very hopeful that the amendment may be defeated, and that there may be no excuse, as has been suggested, for the belief, either by friends or foes, that America is weakening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with everything the Senator from Delaware has just stated. We are in the war and have pledged ourselves to win the war. It is immaterial whether England or Canada or any other of our allies withdraw—we are still in the war and are pledged to win the war.

Mr. President, it is my opinion that this is not a time to do anything which might in any way interfere with the momentum of the action which is now being taken against the common enemy. The fact that Canada has done a certain

thing or that England at this moment were to say that she is not going to send any more soldiers over 31 into combat, is immaterial, for the fact is that the United States is winning the war, and will continue to fight until the war is won.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine is a very natural amendment, and I am sure we all feel great sympathy for the thought which inspired the amendment, which is to lighten the load of those who are past youth wherever it is humanly possible to do so. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Maine, however, to a matter which has not so far, I believe, been discussed. If the Senator's amendment were to be adopted we would have this situation: There are already in the Army many hundreds of thousands of men who are more than 31 years of age. They would naturally feel that an injustice had been done to them, namely that they had been taken into the service and, so far as the amendment is concerned, would remain in the service not only until after Germany was defeated, but until Japan was defeated.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate the force of what the Senator says, but I do not know whether the Senator heard the figures which were given. There have been a very limited number taken in this group. Only about 5 percent in this group were taken prior to the last 2 or 4 months, and they were practically all bachelors. Most of those now being taken are married men with three or four children. That is the distinction between the 31-year-olds who are now being taken and the others. It is expected that, following the adoption of the amendment, there will be strong movement to discharge many of those married men who are in the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure the argument of the Senator from Maine, and much of his logic, is very reasonable. But I was attempting to point out that the man over 31 years of age who is already in the service, perhaps standing in a fox hole, or in a trench, or stationed in a ruined town, would say to himself something like this, "What kind of a country is this that takes me away from my wife and children and keeps me over here in a war? I have already been in for a year, or a year and a half, and to all intents and purposes my country proposes to keep me in the service until the Japanese, too, are defeated, and perhaps use me in the battles incident to the attainment of that goal, and at the same time declares the policy that hereafter no one who is in my general classification shall be drafted for service in the Army."

Whether that reasoning would be altogether well-founded I am not at this moment arguing. But the fact remains that the amendment would be accepted by many men in the service and by their loved ones at home as having put the class of men who are already in the serv-

ice in a category apart, and as calling on them for greater sacrifices than will henceforth be demanded of men in that group. Therefore, if the Senator's amendment were to prevail, the natural corollary would have to be coupled with it, to wit, that all men already in the service who are 31 years of age would have to be discharged if even-handed justice were to be meted out.

I think the proper way to handle this matter, if I may suggest it, is as follows: The Army already knows, insofar as it values the opinion of Congress in military matters, that there is an overwhelming desire in the House and in the Senate not to draft fathers who have children, and I think the whole tendency of the draft recently has been to cater to that philosophy wherever military necessity permits.

But I say that if there were no greater reason against the amendment than the one I have suggested, we ought not to adopt it, because hundreds of thousands of men over 31 already in the service, having borne the brunt of the battle and suffered wounds, and knowing that no more of their class were to be drafted, would feel that they had been unjustly dealt with, and it would create a sickening of heart among them as well as among their wives and their children who were old enough to understand.

Mr. President, I believe it would be very ill advised for the Senate to adopt the amendment, and I say that not from any lack of sympathy for the motives which I am sure inspired the Senator from Maine to offer the amendment, but in the interest of justice.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator suggests a somewhat sadistic attitude on the part of the boys who are in the service—that misery loves company. I think the Senator does a certain measure of injustice to these young men who, I think, in the progress of the war would be profoundly grateful that perhaps other married men were not going to be compelled, as the result of developments, to make a similar sacrifice. They might find in the amendment the hope the Senator suggests that perhaps in due course they might be released. I think that might be a persuasive argument, but I believe it is by no means necessary.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has quite well, I believe, stated my own point of view, namely, that if the amendment were adopted the men in the service would immediately ask that they be given the same treatment, having already done their share, as has been given to the same class at home which has not already done its share.

Mr. BREWSTER. Of course, it is the policy of the War Department, as we understand, that married men shall be given consideration, and all married men over 31 would receive consideration anyway. Senators must bear in mind that at the present time most men over 31 in the service are bachelors, not married men.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe the Senator, who had a fine record himself in World War No. 1, I will recall that when we

picked up the newspapers and found that a strike was in progress somewhere, whether it was just or was not just, or founded on reasonable grounds or not, we would say, "What kind of a country are we fighting for over here, facing the enemy, and losing our comrades, while men at home refuse to work for the highest wages paid in history?" That is what we used to say. That being true, I am sure the Senator can transport himself back to those days, and if he were drafted then, and had a wife and children, and he learned that those now in the same class in which he was were no longer to be drafted, he would begin to wonder if someone had not caught him when he was not looking, and inflicted a serious injustice upon him.

Mr. President, as one who sympathizes with the motive which inspired the amendment, I appeal to the Senator not to press it. I really believe he would be very wise if he were to withdraw the amendment. I believe that would be in the interest of unity in the country and of morale in the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Austin	Hart	Murdock
Bailey	Hatch	Murray
Bankhead	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Overton
Burton	Hoey	Radcliffe
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	La Follette	Shipstead
Chandler	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Cordon	McCarran	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Taylor
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tunnell
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tydings
Fulbright	Maybank	Walsh
Gerry	Millikin	White
Green	Mitchell	Wiley
Guffey	Moore	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. My colleague [Mr. HAYDEN] is absent on official business. If he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. LANGER. I announce that my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is unavoidably absent on Government business, being at Pittsburgh attending a committee hearing. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], are absent visiting various concentration and prison camps in Europe.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent as a delegate to the International Conference in San Francisco.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent attending the funeral of his father.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPER] is absent on public business. If present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent conducting hearings in Pittsburgh, in behalf of the Senate.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of a death in his family. If present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are detained on official business.

I am advised that if present the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—11		
Aiken	Langer	Taft
Brewster	Moore	Walsh
Chandler	Revercomb	White
Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead	
NAYS—57		
Austin	Donnell	Hatch
Bailey	Downey	Hawkes
Bankhead	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Bilbo	Ellender	Hill
Burton	Ferguson	Hoey
Butler	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Byrd	Gerry	Kilgore
Capehart	Green	La Follette
Capper	Guffey	Lucas
Chavez	Gurney	McCarran
Cordon	Hart	McClellan

McFarland	Murdock	Smith
McKellar	Murray	Stewart
McMahon	O'Daniel	Taylor
Magnuson	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Maybank	Overton	Tobey
Millikin	Radcliffe	Tunnell
Mitchell	Robertson	Tydings
Morse	Russell	Wiley

NOT VOTING—28

Andrews	Glass	Thomas, Utah
Ball	Hayden	Vandenberg
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Wagner
Bridges	Mead	Wheeler
Briggs	Myers	Wherry
Brooks	Pepper	Willis
Buck	Reed	Wilson
Bushfield	Saltonstall	Young
Connally	Scruggam	
George	Thomas, Idaho	

So Mr. BREWSTER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate and is open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2625) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the President pro tempore appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I object to the proposal of the Senator from Alabama. I do not see why we should request a conference. Possibly the House will accept the amendment made by the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator wishes to object, that is his privilege; but it has been the practice of the Senate to proceed in the way I have suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Parliamentary Clerk advises the Chair that in this case a Senator cannot object. The Senator may make such a motion.

Mr. TAFT. I still object to the request. Certainly the request must be put. It seems to me it is not customary to act in such a way. Very frequently we pass bills with amendments without requesting a conference. In fact, the procedure is usually the other way. An amendment is adopted and sent to the other House; and if the other House does not concur, it requests a conference thereon.

It seems to me that in the present case we should give the House of Representatives an opportunity to concur in our amendment, without requesting a conference. I do not know what sort of motion the Senator desires to make, but it seems to me the burden is on him to make any motion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my request was that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. On that question I request a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator make a motion to that effect?

Mr. HILL. I so move.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Mitchell
Austin	Hart	Morse
Bilbo	Hatch	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Overton
Burton	Hill	Radcliffe
Butler	Hoey	Revercomb
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Chandler	Kilgore	Stewart
Chavez	La Follette	Taft
Donnell	Langer	Taylor
Eastland	Lucas	Tobey
Ellender	McCarran	Tunnell
Ferguson	McKellar	Tydings
Fulbright	McMahon	Walsh
Gerry	McNuson	White
Green	Maybank	Wiley

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not intend to keep the Senate long, but we have adopted only one amendment to the bill, and I do not know why we should assume the House will not accept it. The Members of the House have not had it before them, and I see no reason why we should request a conference, or assume that there is a difference between the two Houses. It seems very clear to me that we should let the bill go to the House, and let the House determine whether they wish to accept our amendment and ask for a conference, if a conference is necessary because they do not accept our amendment.

It is quite true that the practice in connection with appropriation bills, when there is a long list of differences and when there must be a conference, is to make such a motion, to save a little time, but that is not the rule or the custom in regard to other bills, and I do not see any reason at all why we should adopt this motion, why we should not simply vote down the motion, let the bill go to the House, and let the House decide whether they wish to accept the amendment. I therefore believe the motion of the Senator from Alabama should be voted down, and on it I ask for a division.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is entirely within the discretion of the House as to whether or not they want to go to conference or want to agree to the Senate amendment. We do not determine that question at all, and following the procedure which we are asked to pursue, we in no way affect the decision in the House. If the House wants to agree to the amendment, it can do so. If it wishes to have the bill go to conference, it can do so. The matter is entirely within the discretion and power of the House, and we do not affect them by our action.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, is the Senator's motion that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the House agrees to the amendment, it will not be necessary to have a conference.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. But the conferees on the part of the Senate would be instructed to insist upon the Senate amendment.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama, on which a division has been requested.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2603.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2603) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting two conventions, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

John W. Snyder, of Missouri, to be Federal Loan Administrator;

James J. Caffrey, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Com-

mission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1945, vice Robert H. O'Brien; and

James J. Caffrey, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 1950.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernard J. Flynn to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Bruce Matthews to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of this confirmation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of this and all other confirmations of today.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leon O. Boling to be postmaster at McCleary, Wash.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask the acting majority leader what the program is for the next day or two, if he is in a position to state.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we propose on tomorrow to proceed to the consideration of the appropriation bill which is now the unfinished business. If we finish the appropriation bill in time, I shall ask consent for the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, starting at the point where we left off at the last call.

Mr. WHITE. Does the leader have knowledge of any other legislative matters which are to be ready within the next 2 or 3 days?

Mr. HILL. I cannot advise the Senator as to that tonight. I shall endeavor to advise him further tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 25, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24 (legislative day of April 16), 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Bernard J. Flynn to be United States attorney for district of Maryland.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

W. Bruce Matthews to be United States marshal for District of Columbia.

POSTMASTER

WASHINGTON

Leon O. Boling, McCleary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, honorary professor of the Catholic University of Chile, and a fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, cofounder and organizer of the Inter-American Seminars at the University of San Marcos, Lima, Peru, the University of Habana, and the National University of Mexico, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Lord God, light of mankind, whose grace will be needed in abundance in the hour of victorious peace, look down with eyes of favor upon the Speaker of this House and all the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mindful of past service and inspired with hopes for the future, we beg Thy blessings for the President of the United States that he, like his illustrious predecessor, may continue to cherish the rich values of inter-American friendship.

Deeply conscious of our debt of gratitude to the other Americas in a war which imperiled all freedoms, we invoke Thy benediction upon these representatives of the people who are gathered in this celebration of Pan-American Day in order to show their spirit of democratic brotherhood under God with their fellow Americans of the other American republics and Canada. Illuminate their minds, dear Saviour, with the torch of Thy revelation and strengthen their wills to encourage the youth of the land to weld the precious metal of the good-neighbor policy into the gold of world friendship.

This we ask through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2687. An act to grant the honorary rank of colonel to Edward J. Kelly, major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Security Agency.
5. National Archives.
6. Office of Defense Transportation.
7. United States Railroad Retirement Board.
8. War Manpower Commission.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 2689, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. It is not presently available, although it has been agreed upon. I ask unanimous consent that I may submit it at any time prior to the adjournment of the House today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not, is the gentleman going to file the report today?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order that the House might be advised, there has been a conference report filed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] which will come up as the first order of business tomorrow. I also desire to advise the gentleman as well as the Members of the House that the conference report submitted by the gentleman from Georgia will be taken up tomorrow following the action on the conference report filed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. TARVER. That will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Anderson,	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bender
N. Mex.	Barrett, Pa.	Bennett, Mo.
Andresen,	Barry	Bland
August H.	Beall	Bloom

Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Rayfield
Bradley, Pa.	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Havener	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Rich
Byrne, N. Y.	Hendricks	Richards
Campbell	Herter	Robinson, Utah
Canfield	Hobbs	Rockwell
Cannon, Fla.	Holmes, Mass.	Rodgers, Pa.
Chapman	Holmes, Wash.	Rogers, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Howell	Ryder
Chipperfield	Izac	Sabath
Clark	Jackson	Savage
Clements	Kefauver	Shafer
Cochran	Kelley, Pa.	Sharp
Cole, Mo.	Kerr	Short
Cooley	Kopplemann	Slaughter
Curley	Kunkel	Somers, N. Y.
D'Alesandro	Latham	Stewart
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Talle
Dawson	Lynch	Taylor
Dirksen	McGlinchey	Thomas, N. J.
Domenegeaux	Maloney	Thomason
Doyle	Manasco	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Fellows	May	Walter
Fuller	Morgan	Weaver
Fulton	Morrison	Weichel
Gardner	Mott	Weiss
Gillette	Pace	West
Gore	Peterson, Fla.	White
Gorski	Pfeiffer	Wilson
Granahan	Philbin	Winter
Green	Ploeser	Wolfenden, Pa.
Griffiths	Powell	Wolverton, N. J.
Gross	Price, Fla.	Worley
Gwinn, N. Y.	Quinn	
Hall,	Rabin	
Leonard W.	Rains	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 311 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3024) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 437) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. JONES reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN.]

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we gather today for the sole purpose of commemorating Pan-American Day, we do so with a spirit of sadness in realization of the great shock and bereavement to this country, and to the world, and certainly to the Americas, which caused its postponement from Saturday a week ago, 2 days after our great President Roosevelt was called to his well-earned reward and rest,